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INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW
INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW

Simon Fraser University (SFU) was created in 1963 by the government of British Columbia to relieve enrollment pressures on the University of British Columbia by providing basic programs in the arts and sciences and teacher education. The province created SFU by amending the University Act that governed the University of British Columbia, which ultimately granted SFU a significant measure of autonomy. SFU’s first chancellor, Gordon Shrum, was quick to exploit this by expanding the University’s mandate to incorporate graduate education and research, thus setting the stage for SFU’s quick rise to prominence as both a teaching and research intensive institution. When it opened its doors in 1965, SFU’s 2,500 new students included 83 graduate students, 33 of whom were PhD candidates.

SFU’s institutional culture was profoundly shaped by its birth in the cultural ferment of the mid-1960s. From the outset, there was a visionary quality to SFU’s creation, and that vision—in keeping with its moment—was experimental, fluid, and surprisingly and consciously democratic.

In many ways, SFU’s youth shaped its future: newly minted PhDs came to SFU seeking an opportunity to shape the new University in ways not thought possible at older institutions. They were young and idealistic and their hopes were more than met. Empowered beyond their expectations within the new and quickly developing institution, they brought their youthful energies, creativity, and desire for innovation, and built them into the fabric of SFU’s institutional culture. In doing so, they contributed enormously to the boldness and the willingness to try new ideas and approaches that still distinguish SFU. Innovative faculty were matched with adventurous students, who chose SFU precisely because it was new and promised to be different.

Among Canadian universities, SFU was the first to introduce the trimester system (1964), to offer athletic scholarships (1964), to instill student representation on its Senate (1967), to create an executive MBA (1968), to implement computerized registration (1970), to establish the first department of Women’s Studies in Canada (1972), and to appoint a female president (Dr. Pauline Jewett—1974). This tradition of innovation continues into the present day, with SFU becoming the first university outside of the United States to achieve status as the only Canadian member in the National Collegiate Athletic Association, or NCAA (2012), and the first major Canadian research-intensive university to receive accreditation from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (2015).

SFU, which celebrated its 50th anniversary in 2015, has grown into one of Canada’s premier comprehensive universities and British Columbia’s second largest research-intensive university. It boasts three campuses in three adjacent cities within the Lower Mainland of British Columbia: Burnaby (its main campus), Vancouver, and Surrey. SFU has approximately 35,000 students (unique headcount) enrolled in for-credit programs, another 20,000 participating annually in non-credit programs, 3,000 faculty and staff, and over 130,000 alumni.

In the 2017 Maclean’s rankings of Canadian universities, Simon Fraser University was named the top comprehensive university for the third straight year.¹ SFU was one of the top ten universities in Canada according to the 2017 Times Higher Education World University Rankings.² It ranked 11th among Canadian universities in the QS Universities 2016/17 World Rankings,³ and, for the tenth consecutive year, SFU was named one of the country’s best employers in Canada’s 2017 Top 100 Employers competition.⁴

---

¹ http://www.macleans.ca/education/unirankings/university-rankings-2017-comprehensive/
⁴ http://www.canadastop100.com/national/
INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES
INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

Since SFU’s submission of the Comprehensive Initial Accreditation Self-Evaluation report in February 2016 and the NWCCU Evaluation Committee’s site visit in April 2016, a number of significant changes have occurred, or are occurring, at SFU.

REAFFIRMATION OF THE SFU STRATEGIC VISION/MISSION

The SFU Vision/Mission “An Engaged University” was approved by the University Senate on November 7, 2011 and adopted by the Board of Governors on November 24, 2011. SFU officially launched the Vision/Mission to the University community and the public on February 20, 2012. The Vision/Mission was considered at a retreat for the President and Vice-Presidents on June 3 and 4, 2016 and the Vision/Mission and three Core Themes of Engaging Students, Engaging Research, and Engaging Communities were reaffirmed.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

Two new Vice-Presidents have been appointed:

- Vice-President, Academic and Provost
  Dr. Peter Keller has an exceptional record of academic governance, teaching, research, and community engagement. He came to SFU following an impressive tenure at the University of Victoria where he was a professor in the Department of Geography and, most recently, served two terms as Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences.

- Vice-President, Advancement and Alumni Engagement
  Mr. Michael den Haan brings extensive relevant experience in post-secondary education as Associate Vice-President, Principal Gifts at the University of Waterloo (2013-2016) and Executive Director of Advancement, Faculty of Medicine at the University of Toronto (2007-2013).

INTRODUCTION OF THE BRITISH COLUMBIA’S GOVERNMENT QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS AUDIT (QAPA) OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

The purpose of the audit is to ensure that rigorous, ongoing program and institutional quality assessment processes are being implemented. A two-year QAPA pilot has been launched, and Simon Fraser University is one of two institutions to undergo an audit in 2017. The submission of a self-evaluation on quality assurance processes will be followed by a site visit of three assessors from other similar Canadian institutions appointed by the Ministry of Advanced Education. The intention is to audit all post-secondary institutions every eight years.

CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

- Vancouver Innovation Centre and Residences (complete)
  The project includes residences and ancillary spaces, together with an Innovation Centre on the second level and a Café space on the ground floor. (34,267 square feet, $18.7M)

- Student Union Building (under construction)
  The new Student Union building will be entirely devoted to students, with lounges, study areas, meeting rooms, and recreational facilities. Some of the key features include a napping room, a community kitchen, an online gaming lounge, music rooms, and a live performance stage. (110,750 square feet, $65M)

5 http://www.sfu.ca/content/dam/sfu/engage/StrategicVision.pdf
• Sustainable Energy and Environment Engineering Building (under construction)
The planned building will house Mechatronics labs, a 400-seat lecture hall, and a new Sustainable Energy Engineering program in Surrey, one of BC’s fastest growing municipalities. Over 800 students, faculty, and staff will utilize the research, innovation, and commercialization space in the facility. (172,222 square feet, $116M)

NEW COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM
SFU recently launched a Student Evaluation of Teaching and Courses (SETC) initiative, a new online system that has replaced pen-and-paper course evaluations in many SFU academic units. Ultimately, the SETC initiative is about providing instructors and administrators with better information for use in developing effective student learning experiences. The system focuses less on student perceptions of instructors and more on how students learn.

NEW STRATEGIC RESEARCH PLAN
The Vice-President, Research published a new Strategic Research Plan (2016-2020) in January 2017. Aligned with SFU’s Vision/Mission of being a leading engagement university, SFU will aspire to be a world leader in knowledge mobilization building on a strong foundation of fundamental and applied research.

INNOVATION STRATEGY
SFU launched an innovation strategy—SFU Innovates—that will create and harness a network of innovation initiatives and partnerships to establish SFU as a leader in developing talent, technology, and transformative ideas. The strategy will support a lifecycle approach to innovation and entrepreneurship that mobilizes creative minds and research strengths to contribute to British Columbia’s economic, social, and environmental well-being.

RESPONSE TO TOPICS

PREVIOUSLY REQUESTED BY THE COMMISSION
3. RESPONSE TO TOPICS PREVIOUSLY REQUESTED BY THE COMMISSION

The following are SFU’s responses to recommendations 1 and 3, which were made by the NWCCU Evaluation Committee in their Initial Accreditation Peer-Evaluation Report that came as a result of the committee’s visit to SFU in April 2016.

3.1 RECOMMENDATION 1: INDICATORS FOR ASSESSMENT

The Evaluation Committee recommends that the institution develop indicators and metrics across all levels of the University to more fully assess accomplishment of core theme goals through the collection of appropriately defined data (Standards 1.B.2, 3.B.3, and 4.A.1).

PROGRESS TO DATE

3.1.1 INTRODUCTION

Simon Fraser University’s Vision/Mission was developed after extensive consultation within and beyond the University and was launched in February 2012. In support of this Vision/Mission, SFU adopted three core themes, each with its associated goal. The Vision/Mission and core themes were reaffirmed in June 2016.

Following the launch of the Vision/Mission, the University Planning Framework (UPF) was developed. Its aim is to show how SFU’s Vision/Mission is to be achieved and supported through the contributions of all institutional plans and planning processes.

During the development of the Planning Framework, a fourth theme was added: Leveraging Institutional Strength. This fundamental theme supports the three core themes. Its intent is to ensure that resources and capacity are in place so that core theme activities can be carried out.

The Vision/Mission and its themes are depicted in the figure below.

Figure 1: SFU’s Vision/Mission

To be the leading engaged university defined by its dynamic integration of innovative education, cutting-edge research, and far-reaching community engagement.

ENGAGING STUDENTS
To equip students with the knowledge, skills, and experiences that prepare them for life in an ever-changing and challenging world.

ENGAGING RESEARCH
To be a world leader in knowledge mobilization building on a strong foundation of fundamental research.

ENGAGING COMMUNITIES
To be Canada’s most community-engaged research university.

FUNDAMENTAL THEME: LEVERAGING INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTH
To become financially flexible through continuous improvement of administrative systems, strengthening of infrastructure, and recruitment and retention of the best people.
SFU’s Vision/Mission and its underlying principles are at the centre of the University Planning Framework, and its principles and philosophy permeate all aspects of the University’s governance and culture. As depicted below, the Academic Plan, the Strategic Research Plan, and the Community Engagement Strategy, which contribute to the achievement of core theme goals and outcomes, form the main linkages between the Vision/Mission and the Faculty plans, departmental plans, and functional plans. All plans are constrained by the two outer circles—Financial Model and Governance Model.

Figure 2: Depiction of SFU’s Planning Framework

8 http://www.sfu.ca/vpacademic/academic_planning/academic_plans.html
10 https://www.sfu.ca/engage(strategy.html
The UPF, which is updated regularly, provides a means for determining future initiatives, allocating resources, and measuring success. It provides guidance to all institutional planning activities and includes mechanisms for monitoring progress and achievements. It is a dynamic document that reflects the University’s response to its changing environment.

The UPF includes goals for each core theme, expected outcomes for each theme, and indicators to measure theme performance.

The Planning Framework is reviewed by the Board of Governors and the Senate and is available on SFU’s website.

Outcomes have been determined for each core theme goal. For each outcome, a number of indicators have been identified, each with a rationale for its adoption as a valid and reliable indicator of progress. These indicators are expected to provide a means of assessing whether each outcome is being achieved.

Ultimately, the Planning Framework’s purpose is to provide direction for all University planning activities and to ensure such planning aligns with the Vision/Mission. For example, the Academic Plan 2013-2018 is closely aligned to the three core themes of the Vision/Mission and follows the principles outlined in the University Planning Framework. The Academic Plan’s first progress report was completed in November 2014 and the second one in June 2016. The Faculty Plans are in alignment with the Academic Plan and the three core themes.

### 3.1.2 VISION/MISSION AND CORE THEMES – INDICATORS

Since the launch of the Vision/Mission and the release of the Planning Framework, SFU has undertaken Strategic Reviews in 2014 and in 2015. In the 2015 Strategic Review, certain indicators were improved, an outcome was added to one of the core themes, and a number of actions to improve performance were developed. These were considered by the University Planning Committee and approved by the President and Vice-Presidents. The University Planning Framework was subsequently updated.

SFU’s Strategic Review process demonstrates the University’s commitment to Vision/Mission fulfillment. SFU interprets Vision/Mission fulfillment as the extent to which the University’s clearly articulated purpose and intentions are being achieved through its three core themes and fundamental theme. The purpose of the Strategic Review is to provide substantive evidence that SFU is accomplishing its outcomes, and, if necessary, provide recommendations regarding outcomes and indicators.

As part of the Strategic Review, the University Planning Committee (UPC) undertook a careful analysis of the data collected by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. Initially, SFU looked for trends in the data, with a positive trend as the goal. Having experienced the use of indicators in this manner, the University has begun to assign specific targets or “target bands” for indicators, wherever possible. Based on the results of the Strategic Review, the UPC made an overall assessment that the core themes’ associated goals were being achieved – therefore, the University Vision/Mission was being fulfilled.

The Strategic Review was approved by the President and Vice-Presidents and reviewed by Senate and the Board of Governors. It has since been placed on the University’s website as a public document.

Following NWCCU’s recommendation that SFU should more fully assess accomplishment of core theme goals through the collection of appropriately defined data across all levels of the University, a review of all indicators was undertaken by the theme teams whose purpose it is to review strategies and indicators for each theme. Their reports were completed in December 2016.


12 [https://www.sfu.ca/pres/reports-initiatives.html](https://www.sfu.ca/pres/reports-initiatives.html)
In summary, the theme team reports recommended the following:

Core Theme – Engaging Students

The Engaging Students core theme was assessed in detail for the Mid-Cycle Report submitted to the NWCCU in September 2014. As part of that submission, the theme team assessed the progress being made and provided recommendations for improving the indicators. For the 2016 Comprehensive Initial Accreditation Self-Evaluation Report, the assessment provided in 2014 was updated.

The theme team, led by an Associate Vice-President, met again in the fall of 2016 to re-examine the theme and found that there was general satisfaction with the goal and its description. The team also reviewed the indicators associated with each outcome and the data acquired to determine the relevance of the indicators as a measure of this theme and as a component of Vision/Mission fulfillment. The theme team also found these to be satisfactory.

Overall, SFU is achieving satisfactory progress on its Engaging Students core theme. In addition to the information collected related to the theme’s indicators, there is considerable evidence from institutional, provincial, and national surveys to substantiate the claim. SFU is committed to countless programs and services to maintain and improve its performance. “Student life” has been noted as an area for improvement, and the institution is committed to undertaking the challenge in collaboration with students and the broader campus community.

Core Theme – Engaging Research

The theme team reviewed the indicators for this theme and concluded that the nine indicators for its four outcomes are still valid; however, a recommendation was made to redefine one of the indicators. The “number of undergraduate enrollments in research courses” indicator was revised to capture more broadly all undergraduate enrollments in courses involving research at the lower and upper division levels. Under the new methodology, it is proposed that research training be considered more broadly to include all enrollments in courses involving research methods, field methods, directed reading, capstone project, or honours thesis/extended essay. However, undergraduate research awards would not be counted as part of this metric.

Considerations for further improvements to research data collection are currently under discussion, and a task force has begun work on identifying various options, including a new faculty CV system to streamline and improve collection of publication data to address the shortcoming of existing databases in their under-representation of the diversity of forms of scholarship, particularly in the arts, humanities, and social sciences.

The Strategic Research Plan for 2016-2020 has only recently been published, and the indicators that flow from this plan will be included in the review of this core theme’s performance.

Core Theme – Engaging Communities

The theme team responsible for reviewing the indicators for the Engaging Communities core theme identified a number of improvements to the three existing indicators and considered adding a fourth one.

A future model for the “alumni engagement score” indicator is being explored that may capture a wider assortment of engagement variables and classify alumni in more specific terms. Prior to finalizing the model, the top 100 donors will be tested using the model that is selected to ensure validity and the intended outcomes result from applying the model.

SFU International is investigating a shift from the current “number of active international partners” indicator to a multi-variable assessment of global engagement that reflects, not only the number of international agreements, but also considers the various types of international activities as indicators of engagement. These indicators would be derived from a range of data, including international
student mobility numbers, numbers of international degree-seeking students, global donor profile, engaged international alumni, international development projects, number of joint research publications with international collaborators, etc.

The current “number of participants in local outreach programs” indicator provides a quantitative dimension to attendance, but the theme team observed that it doesn’t provide a useful indicator of participant satisfaction or impact. The theme team is interested in evolving to a greater understanding of the impact of community engagement by further investigating and implementing qualitative research and assessment.

The addition of a fourth indicator, “average fundraising activity,” is being considered. The intent would be to provide a three-year average of fundraising activity by fund type to demonstrate how charitable giving contributes to University priorities.

**Fundamental Theme – Leveraging Institutional Strength**

The theme’s purpose is to acknowledge and assess the University’s performance with respect to financial sustainability, reliability of IT services, attracting and retaining the best people, and providing a physical infrastructure that is fit for purpose. The fundamental theme of Leveraging Institutional Strength underpins the success of the University’s three core themes related to students, research, and communities.

The results of the indicators show that the University is undertaking many initiatives to advance this theme. However, the results of the theme team review were consistent with the views of the NWCCU report in that additional indicators were an important step forward in assessing the accomplishments of the University and in better understanding how well the University is fulfilling its mission of engagement.

The following are examples of proposed changes to the indicators for this theme’s outcomes:

**Outcome: SFU has IT services that support its priorities**

IT Services is currently going through a visioning and strategic planning process, referred to as One I.S., and has identified over thirty qualitative and quantitative metrics to assess performance in its nine key organizational dimensions. During the strategic planning process, these metrics will be refined, benchmarked, and tracked to ensure IT is meeting the service needs of the University and its customers and employees. Existing indicators for this outcome will be replaced by a more meaningful set of IT indicators to enhance assessment in this critical function.

**Outcome: SFU attracts and retains the best people**

Human Resources is currently developing a dashboard of “people” metrics. Once the dashboard is complete, a comprehensive data set will be used internally to drive detailed Human Resources strategies and plans, as well as provide ongoing monitoring of departmental performance.

**Outcome: SFU has facilities that meet its needs**

While the Facilities Condition Index (FCI) remains the best singular measure for the assessment of SFU’s physical infrastructure, an additional four indicators have been developed to further assess the degree to which the facilities meet the needs of the University. These may be included as strategic indicators or used as secondary data to provide texture and understanding of the FCI.
3.1.3 STRATEGIC PLANS - INDICATORS

Academic Plan

Within the Vice-President, Academic’s portfolio, an assessment of progress toward the Academic Plan\footnote{https://www.sfu.ca/vpacademic/academic_planning/academic_plans.html} objectives is carried out biennially. In recent years, this was done in November 2014 and, again, in June 2016.

The Vice-President, Academic employs a number of indicators and key performance measures to assess and manage the activities reported on in the Consolidated 2013-2018 Academic Plan Progress Report, which is sent to Senate and the Board of Governors for information. In the 2016 assessment, fifteen indicators were analyzed over a five-year period to determine trends and progress being made. This analysis informs the three core theme teams in their review. In addition, other relative data are collected, analyzed, and published regularly on the Institutional Research and Planning website.\footnote{http://www.sfu.ca/irp.html}

A process to develop the Academic Plan for the next five years (2018-2023) will begin later this year.

Strategic Research Plan

After a lengthy, transparent, and highly participative process led by the Vice-President, Research, a new Strategic Research Plan 2016-2020 was published in January 2017. Aligned with SFU’s Vision/Mission of being a leading engaged university, SFU aspires to be a world leader in knowledge mobilization building on a strong foundation of fundamental and applied research by:

• Supporting and promoting the full continuum of research, from the fundamental generation of knowledge, through the dissemination of that knowledge within the academic community and beyond, to the application of transformative ideas for the benefit of society.

• Promoting research excellence, supporting and encouraging all researchers, including undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, faculty, staff, and community partners, who assist the research mission.

• Leveraging fundamental research strengths, including interdisciplinary research, close community connections, and partnerships and collaborations to become a global leader in research mobilization.

• Seeking opportunities to transfer the results of SFU’s research to the broader society, including policy-makers, civil society leaders, and the community.

In order to effectively create and capitalize on strategic opportunities, SFU will continually assess its progress in meeting the objectives of the Strategic Research Plan. Each year, the Vice-President, Research will develop operational plans that reflect on achievements and outline key actions to help deliver on these objectives. These annual plans will be drafted in consultation with the Vice-President, Academic, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Library, and the Faculties, as well as the Research Operations units.

Indicators have yet to be developed. Once available, the indicators’ performance will be assessed and the results will, in turn, serve to inform the review of the three core themes within the Strategic Review process.
**Strategic Community Engagement Action Plan**

The Vice-President, External Relations is leading a process to develop an institution-wide Strategic Community Engagement Action Plan (SCEAP). The SCEAP will define the networks and mechanisms through which community engagement could best be supported at SFU.

The identification of stakeholders and some components of consultation and identification of opportunities and issues have been completed. In the next few months, clear objectives will be defined that will support the outcomes of the Engaging Communities core theme. Once those objectives are agreed upon, indicators will be identified to measure progress in achieving the outputs. These indicators will also be used to provide texture to the theme team assessments of the core themes within the Strategic Review process and will support the determination of Mission fulfillment.

**3.1.4 CONCLUSION**

As demonstrated above, SFU takes very seriously the identification of indicators and the use of data to provide evidence of institutional performance.

The portfolio that supports core theme achievement of Engaging Research through the Strategic Research Plan has recently replaced its five-year strategic plan. Those portfolios that support core theme achievement of Engaging Students and Engaging Communities through the Academic Plan and the Strategic Community Engagement Action Plan respectively are in the process of putting in place a new five-year strategic plan. This will result in a new set of indicators or changes to existing ones, which may be reflected ultimately in an updated University Planning Framework.
3.2 RECOMMENDATION 3: EMERGENCY AND DISASTER PLANNING

The University has done substantial emergency and disaster planning and promulgated the resulting plans to the community. The Evaluation Committee recommends that still more be done, such as annual drills and threat assessments, to ensure the preparedness of all community members (Standard 3.A.5).

3.2.1 INTRODUCTION

SFU Safety and Risk Services (SRS) is committed to ongoing emergency and disaster planning, preparation (training and exercises), and recovery. SRS’s approach is to ensure the operational sustainability of a University-wide enterprise while supporting the safety and security of students, faculty, and staff.

3.2.2 EMERGENCY AND DISASTER PLANNING

The following outlines the key components of SRS’s approach to emergency and disaster planning.

Risk Assessment and Plan Development

A comprehensive approach to risk management includes an enterprise risk management (ERM) process for identifying and addressing high-level risks to the strategic priorities of the University and a more operationally-focused risk assessment within an Operational Continuity Plan that identifies and monitors threats across all units of the University.

The University’s approach to emergency and disaster planning is based on industry best practices and an assessment of emergency and disaster risks that the University may encounter such as earthquake, fire, active shooter, and pandemic.

SFU has developed a Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP)\(^{15}\) that establishes a framework for the University’s emergency preparedness, response, and recovery activities. The CEMP takes an “all-hazards approach” to emergency management, which looks at all potential risks and impacts to ensure that decisions made to mitigate and respond to one type of risk do not increase vulnerability for others. The CEMP has a number of annex plans related to the Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) operations, hazard-specific emergency management, emergency support functions, and service-unit emergency management. The latest revision of CEMP was approved by the Vice-Presidents in October 2016.

Beginning in 2015, the Emergency Planning and Operational Continuity Project is to address individual business unit risks that may impact the larger enterprise.\(^{16}\) Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) was used to identify major areas of risk and to highlight existing controls to address identified risks, for all aspects associated with each entity. FMEA is a systematic, proactive method for evaluating a process, activity, or organizational aspect to identify where and how it might fail and to assess the relative impact of different failures in order to identify the parts of the process or organization that are most in need of change.

The FMEA results show that the overall distribution of assessed risks has changed favourably between 2015 and 2016. In 2015, of the more than 3,300 risks assessed across the entire University, 54 (1.6%) were categorized as either high risk or extreme risk, based on the residual risk scores. In 2016, only eight risks were categorized as high or extreme risk (0.2%). As of the November 2016 report to the SFU Board of Governors, each of these eight risks has since been mitigated to the point of being reduced further. This dramatic reduction in the overall risks faced by the University is attributable to the actions that were, and are continuing to be, taken.

---

15 https://www.sfu.ca/content/dam/sfu/srs/emergency/2016.11.16%20CEMP.pdf
16 http://www.sfu.ca/srs/emergency/EPOC.html
Safety and Risk Services is using the following suite of metrics and criteria to assess performance in this area:

- Annual Enterprise Risk Register and Operational Continuity Plan with details on threats, risks, and treatments, including year-over-year reduction of risk.

- Annual refresher of CEMP.

### 3.2.3 Community Preparation

At SFU, emergency preparation includes:

- Training and exercises (in-class training, drills, tabletop, functional and full-scale exercises that include local emergency first responders and other key stakeholders).

- Education and educational materials.

#### Training and Exercises

Training is provided to prepare response personnel and partners to accomplish their emergency or disaster assignments. It is designed to develop the knowledge, skills, and abilities required in emergency situations. Exercises are conducted to evaluate plans and procedures used during actual emergencies to identify strengths and areas for improvement. When properly integrated, training and exercises produce a program that is designed to improve the delivery of emergency disaster response and recovery activities.

As part of the CEMP, SFU has developed training and exercise plans that outline SFU’s commitment to providing regular training and exercise opportunities to SFU students, staff, and faculty. This includes building-specific fire evacuation drills, SFU-wide earthquake drills, and active threat lockdown drills.

Safety and Risk Services is using the following criteria to assess performance in this area:

- Development and operational implementation of training and exercise plans.

#### Training

To support SFU’s emergency management efforts, a variety of training is needed to ensure staff and volunteers have the knowledge and skills needed to perform a wide array of duties. Training needs to be regularly conducted and refreshed to ensure that it remains current. Providing an ongoing commitment to training each year will ensure that momentum is maintained, and skills and knowledge are continually improved and maintained.

The training program plan outlines the various types of training that is needed and shows the number of sessions per year. Training is provided by SFU and may be conducted by internal resources or contracted to an appropriate provider.

Below is an annual training schedule, which includes the type of training, description, and frequency. Dates for training will be confirmed at the start of each year or through the year. The number of sessions offered may vary depending on the need but will, in general, reflect the numbers shown in the schedule.
Table 1: Annual Training Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Aid</td>
<td>Organized by ECP for EVT, Building Evacuation Team, and SCSPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Evacuation Team</td>
<td>Conducted by ECP for Building Evacuation Teams, SFU Tamwood summer camp, and Residence and Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Safety Training - Fire Safety</td>
<td>Conducted by ECP for attendees of Laboratory Safety Training Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Urban Search and Rescue</td>
<td>Organized by ECP for SFU LUSAR Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Damage Assessment</td>
<td>Organized by ECP for SFU RDA Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVT Orientation</td>
<td>Conducted by ECP for new EVTs or those needing a refresher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOC-related training</td>
<td>Organized by ECP for new EOC staff or those needing a refresher (including Policy Group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Internal Training
- Contracted Training

ECP Emergency and Continuity Planning
EOC Emergency Operations Centre
EVT Emergency Volunteer Team
LUSAR Light Urban Search and Rescue
RDA Rapid Damage Assessment
SCSP Student Campus Safety Program

SFU is committed to providing annual training to all its emergency management team members to ensure that they have the knowledge and skills to respond to emergencies on campus.

Exercises
Exercises are the best method for testing plans and ensuring teams work well together. A multi-year commitment to exercises will ensure that momentum is maintained, and skills and knowledge are continually practiced and improved. An exercise program decreases the amount of effort required for each exercise as the emergency response personnel involved in the exercises will be familiar with exercise concepts and requirements.

The goal of the exercise program is to test plans, procedures, and processes in place to respond and recover from emergencies impacting any of the three SFU campus locations or the University as a whole.

Following the building-block approach concept, exercise scenarios and the types of exercise will vary in complexity and will build knowledge and experience from one to the next. Scenarios to be explored in the exercises will align with risk assessments and will address areas of high risk and concern for the University. Scenarios will be selected to meet the objectives of the specific exercise.
In this program plan, SFU will commit to holding a minimum number of exercises for each identified emergency response personnel to ensure that each team has multiple chances per year to test their plans and gain the important experience of simulating emergency response.

Below is a schedule for exercises to be conducted over three years. One exercise may involve multiple teams. Exercises may also involve other partners, both internal and external. The type of exercise is subject to change, but the number of exercises will remain. Dates for each exercise will be confirmed at the start of each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFU Emergency Response Personnel</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU Emergency Response Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOC Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Command</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Occupants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- **Tabletop Exercise** is a facilitated discussion in which participants discuss aspects of a specific emergency scenario.
- **Drill** (includes Fire Drills) validates and evaluates a single, specific operation or function.
- **Functional Exercise** validates and evaluates multiple functions at a single site.
- **Full-scale Exercise** validates and evaluates multiple functions at multiple sites.

The following exercises have taken place since 2013:

- August 2013: 4D Lab Full-Scale Exercise
- June 2014: Active Threat Full-Scale Exercise
- August 2014: 4D Lab Full-Scale Exercise
- February 2015: Emergency Volunteer Team Full-Scale Exercise
- August 2015: 4D Lab Full-Scale Exercise
- October 2015: Earthquake Functional Exercise
- May 2016: Emergency Volunteer Team Full-Scale Exercise
- June 2016: Pandemic Functional Exercise

In addition, a number of tabletop exercises were facilitated prior to convocation ceremonies and as part of the emergency management personnel training sessions.

SRS also provides training on emergency procedures to students during bi-annual laboratory safety training; to faculty and staff during new employee orientations; and to contractors during contractor safety orientations. SRS has developed a training module on emergency preparedness and procedures that can be delivered to any SFU department or affiliate on request.
SFU has formed an active threat working group to ensure that the SFU community is aware of the emergency procedures during an active threat incident. The objectives for the working group are to develop a comprehensive active threat plan, promote an active threat informative video that was launched as part of the 2014 full-scale exercise, and establish an annual SFU active threat emergency drill. The first drill is scheduled to take place in spring 2017.

**Education and Educational Materials**

SRS emergency procedures posters have been displayed across all three campus locations and provide SFU students, staff, faculty, and visitors with important information on what to do in an emergency. Threat-specific educational materials are also provided, including, for example, Active Threat.

Throughout the year, SRS organizes or takes part in a number of public awareness events to promote emergency preparedness and procedures to SFU students, staff, and faculty:

- **May:** Emergency Preparedness and Safety Days
- **May:** Information evening for new students and their parents
- **September:** Fire Safety Week
- **September:** Week of Welcome
- **October:** ShakeOut: Annual Earthquake Drill
- **November:** Winterfest: Winter Weather at Burnaby Campus

Within the SRS group, Campus Security provides a range of personal safety and emergency workshops that are available to all students, faculty, and staff.

Safety and Risk Services is using the following criteria to assess performance in this area:

- Adherence to annual schedule and staging of community outreach events.

### 3.2.4 POST-EVENT RECOVERY AND BUSINESS CONTINUITY

The Emergency Planning and Operational Continuity project is now evolving to become the Operational Continuity Plan (OCP). This is being linked and harmonized with other relevant systems and procedures, including the CEMP, Safety and Risk Services Security Department Standard Operating Procedures, and key University policies and procedures related to risk identification, ensuring safety of university community and enterprise-wide business continuity. The 2017 focus for the OCP will be on post-event recovery and business continuity. While some University entities have robust recovery and continuity plans, others have significant work to do. Work on all these plans is being supported and monitored by Safety and Risk Services.

### 3.2.5 CRISIS COMMUNICATIONS

In an emergency, communication to various critical audiences is one of the top priorities. Fast and effective communication can help to save lives and ensure that the right information is getting to the right groups. Several aspects make up the activities under Crisis Communications including:

- Emergency notification and situation updates
- Official communications to key audiences
- Media relations

In an emergency, a variety of notification methods will be utilized to notify the SFU community. Online communications include: email, the SFU website, the SFU Alerts system, and SFU social media channels. On-the-ground communications will include: posting signage and by staff or volunteer teams.

---

17. [https://www.sfu.ca/srs/emergency/response.html](https://www.sfu.ca/srs/emergency/response.html)
All staff, students, and faculty are encouraged to follow SFU social media accounts and to sign up for SFU Alerts, an urgent notification system that will allow the University to quickly contact students, faculty, and staff by SMS text, email, cell phone, and landline. Urgent notifications shall be sent for any security or safety situation that requires one to leave or avoid an area of the University. Subscribers will also be informed if the University is closing one or more campuses or is on standby to close. The SFU Alerts system is tested regularly at a minimum of once a year.

3.2.6 UNIVERSITY POLICIES

In addition to its Risk Management policy, SFU has other related policies on its website that provide guidance to community members. Examples: response to violence and threatening behavior, emergency management, environment management, biosafety, radiological safety, non-ionizing radiation safety, indemnity approval, occupational health and safety, and unscheduled cancellations of classes.

3.2.7 CONCLUSION

Simon Fraser University has adopted a consistent approach for University employees to consider and act upon the likelihood and impacts of risks. The assumption of risk is contingent upon the utilization of all available internal controls and risk management approaches to ensure that residual risk does not exceed established tolerance levels. The approach is guided by provincial risk management guidelines as well as internationally accepted risk management standards and processes.

20 https://www.sfu.ca/policies/gazette/general/gp42.html
21 https://www.sfu.ca/policies/gazette.html
CHAPTER 1

STANDARD ONE: MISSION, CORE THEMES, AND EXPECTATIONS
4. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS 2 AND 3

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT 2 – AUTHORITY

The institution is authorized to operate and award degrees as a higher education institution by the appropriate governmental organization, agency, or governing board as required by the jurisdiction in which it operates.

In 1963, British Columbia’s University Act created SFU and prescribed its governance system, which is composed of a chancellor, a convocation, a board, a senate, and faculties. The Board of Governors and the Senate are the principal governing bodies, with the University Act defining the scope and limits of each one’s authority, membership, and responsibilities. The University Act also grants SFU the authority to award its various degrees.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT 3 – MISSION AND CORE THEMES

The institution’s mission and core themes are clearly defined and adopted by its governing board(s) consistent with its legal authorization, and are appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education. The institution’s purpose is to serve the educational interests of its students and its principal programs lead to recognized degrees. The institution devotes all, or substantially all, of its resources to support its educational mission and core themes.

Simon Fraser University’s Vision/Mission and core themes are appropriate to a research university and are consistent with its legislated authority.

At its November 24, 2011, meeting, the Board of Governors approved the institution’s Vision/Mission. At its November 7, 2011, meeting, the Senate stated that the vision and goals fairly reflected both the aspirations and the mission of Simon Fraser University. The Vision/Mission was officially launched on February 20, 2012 and reaffirmed, along with the core themes, in June 2016.

SFU’s purpose is to serve its students’ educational interests and to have all of its credit-bearing programs lead to degrees, certificates, or diplomas that are recognized as of high academic quality by government, by other degree-granting institutions, and by the public. The University’s resources are entirely devoted, directly or indirectly, to the support of its Vision/Mission and core themes.

22 http://www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws_new/document/ID/freeside/00_96468_01
5. STANDARD 1.A – MISSION

SECTION I: STANDARD 1.A—MISSION

1.A.1 The institution has a widely published mission statement—approved by its governing board—that articulates a purpose appropriate for an institution of higher learning, gives direction for its efforts, and derives from, and is generally understood by, its community.

SFU’S VISION/MISSION

Simon Fraser University’s Vision/Mission is to be the leading engaged university defined by its dynamic integration of innovative education, cutting-edge research, and far-reaching community engagement.

On February 10, 2011, SFU started one of the most extensive community consultation processes ever undertaken by a Canadian university. The goal was to develop a strategic vision/mission that builds upon the University’s three defining strengths:

- SFU’s commitment to students
- SFU’s dedication to research
- SFU’s engagement with community

On November 7, 2011, the SFU Senate concurred that SFU’s Vision/Mission and goals had been developed from a comprehensive and inclusive process, and fairly reflect Simon Fraser University’s aspirations and mission. On November 24, 2011, the University Board of Governors gave final approval to the Vision/Mission. The Vision/Mission and core themes were reaffirmed at a Vice-Presidents’ retreat in June 2016.

Along with this new Vision/Mission, SFU established a complementary tag line: “Engaging the World.”

CORE THEMES AND STRATEGIC GOALS

There are three core themes and strategic goals that guide all new planning at all levels within the institution.

ENGAGING STUDENTS

Goal: To equip SFU students with the knowledge, skills, and experiences that prepare them for life in an ever-changing and challenging world.

ENGAGING RESEARCH

Goal: To be a world leader in knowledge mobilization building on a strong foundation of fundamental research.

ENGAGING COMMUNITIES

Goal: To be Canada’s most community-engaged research university.

FUNDAMENTAL THEME: LEVERAGING INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTH

Although not a core theme that contributes directly to the achievement of the Vision/Mission, this theme ensures that the strategies of the three core themes can be implemented while also contributing to the ongoing success of the institution. This institutional strength includes being well-resourced financially, having well-developed administrative systems, recruiting and retaining excellent faculty and staff, and maintaining and developing supporting physical structures and facilities.
1.A.2 The institution defines mission fulfillment in the context of its purpose, characteristics, and expectations. Guided by that definition, it articulates institutional accomplishments or outcomes that represent an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment.

**INTERPRETATION OF VISION/MISSION FULFILLMENT**

To realize the Vision/Mission, SFU designed a planning process that begins with the Vision/Mission. Using the values, philosophies, and core themes of the Vision/Mission, SFU established goals, which led to strategies for achieving these goals, including the identification of indicators to ensure that the goals were being met. From this process, the University Planning Framework was developed to provide guidance to all institutional planning activities and mechanisms for monitoring progress and achievements. The Planning Framework is a dynamic document that reflects the University’s response to its changing environment.

**ACCEPTABLE THRESHOLD, EXTENT, OR DEGREE OF MISSION FULFILLMENT**

The adoption of best practices requires the review of institutional performance in achieving the Vision/Mission, as well as continuous improvement of indicators. Regular, systematic, participatory, self-reflective, and evidence-based assessments of accomplishments are imperative. Assessments should be linked to quality and operational effectiveness, and should be a measure of Vision/Mission fulfillment.

The assessment, in the form of a Strategic Review, involves data collection and analysis for each indicator identified in the Planning Framework. From these results, an overall assessment is made as to whether the themes’ goals are fulfilling the University Vision/Mission. As well, the Strategic Review includes recommendations for improving the indicators.
The figure below demonstrates the University’s assessment process for determining mission fulfillment. The University Planning Framework’s purpose is to provide direction for all University planning activities and to ensure such planning aligns with the Vision/Mission. Four theme teams, each led by an Associate Vice-President, assess performance for each of the three core themes as well as the fundamental theme. The theme teams’ review and recommendations contribute to a Strategic Review of university performance, which ultimately determines the extent or degree to which the Vision/Mission is being fulfilled.

**Figure 3:**

**MISSION FULFILLMENT**

Steady progression and/or target attainment of prescribed indicators will determine that SFU is achieving its Vision/Mission. In monitoring its performance, SFU makes good use of indicators at a number of levels across the institution.
The figure below illustrates how the indicator’s performance at the operational level informs assessment at the strategic plan level (Academic Plan, Strategic Research Plan, and the Strategic Community Engagement Action Plan), which, in turn, informs the assessment of the core themes in determining mission fulfillment.

**Figure 4:**

**LEVELS OF DATA/INDICATORS AND MISSION FULFILLMENT**

At the end of the planning horizon, new strategic plans are developed and indicators identified. In due course, Strategic Reviews are undertaken that assess the themes’ performance, which may result in indicators in the Planning Framework to be updated.
6. STANDARD 1.B – CORE THEMES

SECTION I: STANDARD 1.B—CORE THEMES

1.B.1 The institution identifies core themes that individually manifest essential elements of its mission and collectively encompass its mission.

In support of its Vision/Mission, SFU has identified three core themes, each with its associated goal and supporting strategies, to help it become the leading engaged university:

- Core Theme 1: Engaging Students
- Core Theme 2: Engaging Research
- Core Theme 3: Engaging Communities

The themes are not independent of one another, but overlap to a large degree, and it is where the themes overlap that SFU’s unique strength can be found.

Figure 5: The integration of SFU’s core themes

- Fundamental Theme: Leveraging Institutional Strength
  For SFU to achieve its Vision/Mission, it must leverage the strength within its human, financial, and capital infrastructures. This fundamental theme addresses SFU’s need to be financially flexible by continuously improving its administrative systems, strengthening its infrastructure, and engaging the best people.

1.B.2 The institution establishes objectives for each of its core themes and identifies meaningful, assessable, and verifiable indicators of achievement that form the basis for evaluating accomplishments of the objectives of its core themes.
6.1 CORE THEME 1: ENGAGING STUDENTS

The education of students is the central purpose for any university, and students’ experience while attending a university can enhance or inhibit their ability to learn. At SFU, students are not “end-users” to be trained and produced, but partners in learning, discovery, and community engagement. In addition to encouraging critical thinking and research skills, SFU provides opportunities for students to gain practical experience, social aptitudes, and civic understanding, not only to be job-ready, but also to be life-ready. Engaging students and helping them achieve their educational and life objectives are at the core of SFU’s Vision/Mission.

**Goal:**
To equip SFU students with the knowledge, skills, and experiences that prepare them for life in an ever-changing and challenging world.

**Strategies:**

- SFU will foster supportive learning and campus environments.
- Combining the best traditions of academic and teaching excellence, SFU will provide students with diverse and transformative learning opportunities that enable them to gain the knowledge, critical capacities, research skills, and civic understanding required to become engaged global citizens and to thrive and adapt in demanding and dynamic environments.
- Students will have opportunities to participate in advanced research, thereby sharing in the labour and joy of creating and applying knowledge, while acquiring the skills for lifelong learning.
- Students will have access to an unparalleled selection of experiential learning opportunities that allow them to apply knowledge, to grow as individuals, to engage with diverse communities, to develop entrepreneurial skills, and to refine their sense of civic literacy.
Table 3: Core Theme 1 - Engaging Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Rationale for Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students gain the knowledge to complete degree requirements.</td>
<td>Undergraduate composite graduation rate (6-year graduation rate) for degree programs</td>
<td>These indicators enable SFU to measure graduation rates of the various types of degrees the University offers as composite indicators for undergraduate and graduate studies, respectively. The selected timeframes are based on the average completion time for the respective types of degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate composite graduation rate (6-year rate for master’s programs and 8-year rate for doctoral programs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate retention rate (%) (year 1 to year 2)</td>
<td>Retention of students in the critical first two years of study is a good indicator of future degree completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate retention rate (%) (year 1 to year 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students acquire skills necessary in an ever-changing and challenging world.</td>
<td>Undergraduate average credits in co-operative education and field schools per graduating student</td>
<td>Co-operative education and field schools are direct on-the-job and practical training experiences where students acquire “real world” working skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate student assessment of skill development (average %), as measured by the BC Baccalaureate Graduate Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate student assessment of skills and abilities acquired during graduate program, as measured by the SFU Graduate Exit Survey</td>
<td>Student self-assessments help SFU to determine if students are acquiring the necessary skills from their studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students apply knowledge in the workplace or further studies.</td>
<td>Undergraduate student assessment of usefulness of knowledge and skills gained in performing job, as measured by the BC Baccalaureate Graduate Survey</td>
<td>SFU alumni most likely apply the knowledge gained at SFU in their employment or further studies after graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate student assessment of graduate experience in current employment/position, as measured by the SFU Graduate Exit Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate student assessment of academic preparation for further studies, as measured by the BC Baccalaureate Graduate Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate student assessment of academic preparation for further studies, as measured by the SFU Graduate Exit Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SFU is satisfied with the performance of these indicators as they provide meaningful and relevant data that help to confirm Vision/Mission fulfillment for the University. They will continue to be monitored and potentially updated.
6.2 CORE THEME 2: ENGAGING RESEARCH

SFU’s Vision/Mission commits the University to becoming a world leader in knowledge mobilization, renowned for its capacity to disseminate knowledge and to harness new ideas and innovations for society’s benefit. This commitment rests on a solid foundation of fundamental research, and at its centre is the five-year Strategic Research Plan, which highlights, supports, and promotes SFU’s continued impact on the research community through output, chairs, and partnerships as it works to fulfill its Vision/Mission.

**Goal:** To be a world leader in knowledge mobilization building on a strong foundation of fundamental research.

**Strategies:**

- SFU will leverage its fundamental research strengths, including interdisciplinary research, close community connections, and partnerships and collaborations to become a global leader in research mobilization.

- SFU will support and promote the full continuum of research, from the fundamental generation of knowledge, through the dissemination of that knowledge within the academic community and beyond, to the application of transformative ideas for the benefit of society.

- SFU will promote research excellence, supporting and encouraging all researchers, including undergraduates, graduate students, faculty, staff members, and community partners who assist the research mission.

- SFU will seek opportunities to transfer the results of its research to the broader society, including policy-makers, civil society leaders, and the community.

**Table 4: Core Theme 2 - Engaging Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Rationale for Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be a world leader in knowledge mobilization building on a strong foundation of fundamental research.</td>
<td>Research is at a high-quality level.</td>
<td>Total number of citations</td>
<td>Citation analysis serves as an output and impact measure. The actual number of citations reflects research productivity, while the frequency of citations reflects the impact of the publications. As it takes several years for the research to be incorporated into work from other researchers, a five-year time window was chosen. The selected performance indicator incorporates both changes in output and impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of publications in top journal percentiles</td>
<td>While citation data are a widely-used indicator of research impact, publications in top journal percentiles provide a metric for benchmarking the quality of the University’s research relative to regional averages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tri-Council research funding ($M)</td>
<td>Total research funding is a generally accepted KPI for university research. It is collected annually by the Canadian Association of University Business Officers and is commonly used in university rankings (Research Infosource, Times Higher Education Index, Maclean’s, etc.). It is an input measure that serves as a good surrogate for research reputation and capacity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 The Tri-Council is: the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research investments</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be a world leader in knowledge mobilization building on a strong foundation of fundamental research.</td>
<td>Number of funded collaborative research projects with external partners</td>
<td>Almost all research carried out in the University requires some funding. Collaborative research is funded by contracts or grants from partner organizations (business, foundations, government branches) or through special programs by the Tri-Council set up to support partnership grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of co-authored publications with external collaborators</td>
<td>Number of co-authored publications with external collaborators provides a concrete measure of research productivity with partners, which showcases the degree of SFU engagement in research with collaborators across multiple levels: national, international, and corporate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research is mobilized through partnerships/collaborations with external partners.</td>
<td>Number of graduate theses submitted to the library</td>
<td>Writing a graduate thesis involves extensive research under the supervision of a senior supervisor and a thesis committee. The number of theses submitted to the library is indicative of the degree of graduate student engagement in research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research is integrated into learning and teaching.</td>
<td>Number of undergraduate enrollments in research courses (revised) (Definition: Research training courses include all courses involving research methods, field methods, directed readings, capstone projects, or an honours thesis/extended essay.)</td>
<td>SFU provides an immersive and supportive environment for undergraduate students to engage with faculty-directed research projects through various activities, including research-intensive courses and funding support for dedicated semesters in research. As such, active participation of undergraduate students indicates the University’s integration of research into learning and teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research investment is leveraged to drive innovation and transfer of technology for the benefit of society and the economy.</td>
<td>Number of new patents filed</td>
<td>As an indicator of the application of transformative ideas for the benefit of society and the economy, and the integration of innovation in research, the University offers support to its researchers in management of intellectual property and transfer of technology. Filing new patents encourages commercialization of research results and external investment in University-led technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of industrial student internships through Mitacs</td>
<td>Mitacs is a successful national program to accelerate innovation across academia and industry through building partnerships that facilitate graduate student internships in industry. The number of Mitacs awards is indicative of the successful engagement of graduate students in pursuing innovative research with commercial opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Strategic Research Plan for 2016-2020 has been developed. The plan builds on strengths and successes, and positions the University to continue to grow its capacity in research and knowledge mobilization. Considerations for further improvements to research data collection are currently under discussion, and a task force has begun work on identifying various options.

### 6.3 CORE THEME 3: ENGAGING COMMUNITIES

Community engagement is defined as collaboration between the university and communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. The term “engagement” contrasts with that of “outreach,” which typically refers to one-way dissemination and communication to the public. SFU’s communities are local, provincial, national, and global, and its partnerships and initiatives involve public and private sector organizations from diverse sectors and industries, as well as academic and professional networks. Engagement with the community is an important component of SFU’s Vision/Mission.

**Goal:**
To be Canada’s most community-engaged research university.

**Strategies:**

- SFU will maintain and expand its community connections as an integral part of its academic mission, creating opportunities for practical and experiential learning; informing and inspiring research; and contributing to its relevance and success.

- SFU will develop partnerships and maximize the capacities of its three campuses to enhance the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities both locally and globally. The University will build respectful and mutually beneficial community relationships.

- SFU will meet lifelong learning needs of students, alumni, and the community, and will respond with innovative programs and learning opportunities for academic, personal, and professional development.

- SFU will be BC’s public square for enlightenment and dialogue on key public issues, and will be known as the institution to which the community looks for education, discussion, and solutions.

**Note:** A Strategic Community Engagement Action Plan is currently being developed, which will define the networks and mechanisms through which community engagement could best be supported at SFU.

---

24 This definition is used by the Carnegie Foundation, an organization that provides a community engagement classification service for US institutions.  
http://www.nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92
## Table 5: Core Theme 3 - Engaging Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Rationale for Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFU is engaged with its alumni.</td>
<td><strong>Alumni engagement score</strong></td>
<td>This multi-level approach is based on research on best practices at several other universities. It allows SFU to evaluate the multi-faceted nature of alumni engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU is engaged locally.</td>
<td>**Fundraising activity (under consideration)**25</td>
<td>Charitable giving to University priorities is an indicator of alumni engagement (and is included in this indicator as one of several weighting factors), community engagement, and alignment with external interests and trends. Charitable gifts support the University’s Vision/Mission and strategic planning across all Faculties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU is engaged globally.</td>
<td><strong>Number of participants in SFU local outreach programs</strong></td>
<td>The number of members of the community that participate in SFU outreach offerings is one measure of SFU’s community engagement. SFU offers a spectrum of outreach programs that provide meaningful engagement with a range of BC communities and age groups. SFU’s youth outreach programs support not only the academic development of children but their aspirations. Community lectures and events provide opportunities to not only share University expertise but also to learn from the community. Programs such as SFU’s Public Square will provide further opportunities to engage all levels of government and communities in topics that are important to the community and where SFU can add value.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Number of active international partners</strong></td>
<td>The number of current agreements with international organizations is an important indicator of SFU’s global engagement. SFU enters into formal agreements with universities and other organizations around the world. These agreements cover a range of opportunities for SFU students, faculty, and staff, including student exchange programs, field schools, faculty exchanges, and research projects. Agreements are time limited and are not renewed if meaningful activity has not taken place. SFU’s international strategy will ensure that new agreements are strategic and resources are in place to support and deepen SFU’s relationships with international partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 A “fundraising activity” indicator is being considered for this core theme. It is felt that, by tracking funds raised, which often come from alumni, SFU will be able to further illustrate its engagement with the community. This, along with a potential new model for the “alumni engagement score” indicator, shows that SFU is looking at ways of strengthening the indicators for this core theme.
6.4 FUNDAMENTAL THEME: LEVERAGING INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTH

Although not a core theme that contributes directly to the achievement of the Vision/Mission, this fundamental theme ensures that the strategies of the three core themes can be implemented while also contributing to the institution’s sustainability. This institutional strength includes being financially well-resourced, having well-developed administrative systems, recruiting and retaining excellent faculty and staff, and maintaining and developing supporting physical structures and facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Rationale for Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFU is financially sound.</td>
<td>Net operating assets as a percentage of consolidated revenues</td>
<td>Net operating assets are a measure of flexibility and liquidity that indicates the degree to which the University is effectively managing its revenue sources, its operating expenses, and its investment portfolio. It is important to build and maintain a healthy surplus as it provides the University reserves that can be utilized to absorb short-term, unanticipated cost fluctuations not included in the operating budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU has IT services that support its priorities.</td>
<td>Joint availability of core services: SFU Connect, Canvas, SIMS, and off-campus internet connectivity (under review)</td>
<td>Joint availability of core services is a measure of system effectiveness, encompassing enterprise collaboration, learning management, student administration systems, and campus network access. The availability to the end-user of these critical components engages a pyramid of supporting hardware and software infrastructure and gives a reasonable and composite reading as to “how things are working” within the IT ecosystem. The metric is further enhanced by its multiplicative nature, thereby making it an important joint measure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU attracts and retains the best people.</td>
<td>Canada’s Top 100 Employers</td>
<td>To attract and retain top quality employees, it is important for the University to be viewed as a highly desirable place to work. The Top 100 list is generated through a rigorous examination of employers and is an influential ranking that is utilized by prospective employees when making career choices. Being included on this list indicates that the University has maintained high employment standards and is creating a very favourable environment in which to work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU has facilities that meet its needs.</td>
<td>Facilities Condition Index (FCI)</td>
<td>The FCI metric indicates the condition of the University’s buildings and related infrastructure and provides a formal basis for analyzing and prioritizing the maintenance needs of the campus. In order for the University to provide a safe, suitable environment for students, faculty, and staff, it has to maintain its assets to an acceptable level. The FCI is an important planning mechanism to ensure this occurs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Leveraging Institutional Strength fundamental theme underpins the success of the University’s three core themes related to students, research, and communities. The indicators for this theme have proven to be both supportive of the three core themes and meaningful in their own right, but a review of key components of this theme is currently underway.
Outcome: SFU has IT services that support its priorities

IT Services is currently undertaking a significant revisioning of its strategies and core services. As a result, IT Services has identified over thirty qualitative and quantitative metrics to assess performance in its nine key organizational dimensions. During the strategic planning process, these will be refined, benchmarked, and tracked to ensure IT is meeting the service needs of the University and its customers and employees. Upon completion of the review, the current indicator will be replaced by a more meaningful set of IT indicators to enhance assessment in critical functions.

Outcome: SFU attracts and retains the best people

The University has recently hired a new head of Human Resources and elevated the role from Executive Director to Associate Vice-President. The new Associate Vice-President has a 2017 plan to complete a dashboard of “people” metrics. There have been significant efforts to date, but there is much work to be done. However, once the dashboard is complete, the comprehensive data set will be used internally to drive detailed Human Resources (HR) strategies and plans, as well as provide ongoing monitoring of departmental performance.

Activity-based assessment indicators are also under review, e.g., the percentage of staff with performance development plans in place or the percentage of budget devoted to staff development. It is expected that such measures will be an important component of the new HR dashboard.

Outcome: SFU has facilities that meet its needs

While the Facilities Condition Index (FCI) remains the best singular measure for the assessment of the University’s physical infrastructure, additional indicators are under development to further assess the degree to which the facilities meet the needs of the University. These include:

1. Percentage of classrooms meeting benchmark quality standards
   Indicator:  total # classrooms/theatres with upgrades <= 20/25 years
               total # classrooms/theatres on campus

2. Total estimate of Priority 1 deferred maintenance
   Indicator:  total value of Priority 1 deferred maintenance outstanding

3. Preventive maintenance completion rates
   Indicator:  total preventative maintenance orders completed annually
               total preventative maintenance orders scheduled

4. Service request turn-around time
   Indicator:  average time between the open and closing of service requests
6.5 UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES OF THE VISION/MISSION AND THE CORE THEMES

In addition to the core themes and fundamental theme, SFU commits to the following underlying principles:

**ACADEMIC AND INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM:**
SFU will be an open and inclusive university whose foundation is intellectual and academic freedom.

**DIVERSITY:**
SFU will foster a culture of inclusion and mutual respect, celebrating the diversity and multi-ethnic character reflected amongst its students, staff, faculty, and our society.

**INTERNATIONALIZATION:**
SFU will value international knowledge, understanding, and engagement, and will seek to engender an active global citizenship among its students, faculty, and staff, and to ensure that SFU is an engaged partner and contributor on the international stage.

**RESPECT FOR ABORIGINAL PEOPLES AND CULTURES:**
SFU will honour the history, culture, and presence of Aboriginal peoples. The University will welcome and nurture Aboriginal students and seek opportunities for greater representation of Aboriginal peoples amongst its faculty and staff.

**SUPPORTIVE AND HEALTHY WORK ENVIRONMENT:**
SFU will recognize, respect, and value the essential contribution made by staff and faculty, and will seek to build and sustain a work environment that is equitable, supportive, rewarding, and enjoyable.

**SUSTAINABILITY:**
SFU will pursue ecological, social, and economic sustainability through its programs and operations. Through teaching and learning, research, and community engagement, SFU will seek and share solutions. In its own operations, it will develop and model best practices, from minimizing its ecological footprint, to maximizing its social health and economic strength.

6.6 CONCLUSION

Simon Fraser University takes great pride in its commitment to quality assurance in teaching, research, and community engagement and continually strives toward a higher level of excellence.

Rigorous evaluation of both outcomes and indicators forms the cornerstone of continuous improvement, and SFU is committed to ensuring that it is using the best possible processes for assessing its performance.
7. CONCLUSION

This Year One Self-Evaluation Report is Simon Fraser University’s first report since being granted initial accreditation by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. SFU remains committed to the standards and best practices that the NWCCU espouses.

SFU would like to thank the NWCCU for its site visit of April 2016 and the subsequent Evaluation Committee report. The University appreciates the feedback and has gone to considerable effort in this Year One Self-Evaluation Report to demonstrate its commitment to continuous improvement in addressing the committee’s recommendations—Recommendations 1 and 3 of the Spring 2016 Initial Accreditation Peer-Evaluation Report.

Response to the recommendation on the development of indicators describes SFU’s approach to the assessment of the institution’s performance in achieving its Vision/Mission. The Vision/Mission and core themes are integrated into a University Planning Framework, which provides guidance to all institutional planning activities. The Planning Framework includes goals for each core theme, expected outcomes for each theme, and indicators to measure theme performance, and performance is regularly assessed through a process of Strategic Review. The purpose of the Strategic Review is to provide substantive evidence that SFU is accomplishing its outcomes, and, if necessary, provide recommendations regarding outcomes and indicators.

Response to the recommendation on emergency and disaster planning highlights the institution’s approach to emergency and disaster planning and provides details of its training and exercise plans and schedules to ensure the safety and security of the community.

In addressing Standard One and Eligibility Requirements 2 and 3, SFU has reaffirmed its Vision/Mission and core themes and has provided a methodology of ongoing assessment of the institution’s performance in achieving its goals.
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**Introduction**

This report is in response to the NWCCU requirement for a Year One self-evaluation of mission and core themes. In this instance, the core theme is “Engaging Students.” This theme and its metrics were reviewed as part of the Core Theme Planning in the SFU Comprehensive Initial Accreditation Self-Evaluation Report to the NWCCU in February of 2016. The Theme Committee reviewed the goal and its metrics in 2015 and had a chance to revisit the work after in the fall of 2016. **The committee is satisfied with the theme description and the metrics.** The vast majority of what is stated in this document is reflected in the Comprehensive Initial Accreditation Self-Evaluation Report that examined the contribution to the overall mission of the University.

**Theme Description**

**GOAL:** To equip students with the knowledge, skills, and experiences that prepare them for life in an ever-changing and challenging world.

**STRATEGIES:**

- SFU will foster supportive learning and campus environments.
  
- Combining the best traditions of academic and teaching excellence, SFU will provide students with diverse and transformative learning opportunities that enable them to gain the knowledge, critical capacities, research skills, and civic understanding required to become engaged global citizens and to thrive and adapt in demanding and dynamic environments.
  
- Students will have opportunities to participate in advanced research, thereby sharing in the labour and joy of creating and applying knowledge while acquiring the skills for lifelong learning.
  
- Students will have access to an unparalleled selection of experiential learning opportunities that allow them to apply knowledge, to grow as individuals, to engage with diverse communities, to develop entrepreneurial skills, and to refine their sense of civic literacy.

**There is general satisfaction with the goal and its strategies.**

The Theme Team Committee examined the indicators as outlined in the Comprehensive Initial Accreditation Self-Evaluation Report and are satisfied that they are appropriate (see Table 1).
### Table 1 - University Planning Framework Indicators – Student Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Goal Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging Students</td>
<td>Students gain the knowledge to complete degree requirements</td>
<td>Undergraduate composite graduation rate (%) (6-year graduation rate for degree programs)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate composite graduation rate (%) (6-year rate for master’s programs and 8-year rate for doctoral programs)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate retention rate (%) (year 1 to year 2)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate retention rate (%) (year 1 to year 2)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students acquire skills necessary in an ever-changing and challenging world</td>
<td>Undergraduate average credits in co-operative education and field schools per graduating student</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate student assessment of skill development (average %), as measured by the BC Baccalaureate Graduate Survey</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate student assessment of skills and abilities acquired during graduate program, as measured by the SFU Graduate Exit Survey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students apply knowledge in the workplace or further studies</td>
<td>Undergraduate student assessment of usefulness of knowledge and skills gained in performing job, as measured by the BC Baccalaureate Graduate Survey</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate student assessment of graduate experience in current employment/position, as measured by the SFU Graduate Exit Survey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate student assessment of academic preparation for further studies, as measured by the BC Baccalaureate Graduate Survey</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate student assessment of academic preparation for further studies, as measured by the SFU Graduate Exit Survey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The retention rates of undergraduates and graduates from year 1 to year 2 are strong. In the case of undergraduates, the current rates are much improved from a decade ago.

• The indicators in support of the outcome of “students acquire the skills necessary in an ever-changing world” are strong. There is an increase in the number of credits that undergraduates are taking in co-operative education and field schools. The data from the BC Baccalaureate Graduate Survey compares favourably to other institutions in the Province.

• The indicators in support of the outcome “students apply knowledge in the workplace or further studies” are favorable. The Committee did note that there was a modest decline in undergraduate students’ assessment of academic preparation for further studies and recommended that this may benefit from further exploration. The number of students that self-report is higher at the time of graduation than it is on the BC Baccalaureate Graduate Survey, which is two-years post-graduation. It is difficult to measure this reliably beyond the two-year assessment but it would be useful to have that information. Nonetheless, the outcomes indicate high levels of knowledge application overall and this is reflected in “real time” by the steady growth in SFU co-operative education programs (i.e., increase in the number of students being hired).

In addition to the stated indicators, the group also considered information from relevant national, provincial, and institutional surveys. All the information reported in this section is publicly available at www.sfu.ca/irp or at the BC Student Outcomes website: http://outcomes.bcstats.gov.bc.ca/BGS/BGS_Info.aspx.

Looking at the national, provincial, and SFU’s own student surveys, it is notable that SFU students report:

• CUSC 2015
  o 88% feel satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of their SFU education (slightly higher than the national average).
  o Satisfaction in terms of their communication skills (written, oral, and interpersonal co-operation) as well as their analytic and learning skills is equal to that of the national average.
  o 75% agree or agree strongly that they feel they are part of the University.
  o 88% indicated they would recommend the University to others (the same as the national average).

• BGS 2014
  o Over 81% of SFU respondents reported that their institution had helped them to develop a variety of such skills.
  o Skills associated with critical analysis and independent learning were rated the highest (91%). Communication skills—reading and comprehending material,
writing clearly and concisely, and verbally expressing opinions or ideas—were also highly rated. Almost nine out of ten graduates (87%) gave reading comprehension the highest ratings, and eight out of ten graduates gave the highest ratings to the skills associated with clear and concise writing (84%) and verbal communication (83%). A similar proportion gave very high or high ratings to skills associated with group collaboration (working effectively with others, 79%) and problem resolution (79%).

- Employed graduates were also asked to rate the usefulness of knowledge, skills, and abilities they acquired during their baccalaureate education in both their work and their day-to-day life. The knowledge, skills, and abilities graduates learned were deemed very useful or somewhat useful in their work by 80% of graduates, and determined to be very useful or somewhat useful in their day-to-day life by 76% of graduates.

  - Fall Undergraduate Student Survey 2014 results were very similar:
    - 88% of respondents are satisfied that SFU is equipping them with critical thinking skills.
    - 90% of respondents are satisfied with their general SFU experience.
    - 87% are satisfied with the quality of teaching.

Overall, the results from the indicators for engaging students are satisfactory. However, as an institution that strives for continuous improvement, there are two areas noted in the surveys where SFU would like to strengthen its programs and services. The first is the observation that students continue to seek and request improvements to student life and campus community (e.g., events, clubs, and athletic events) as well as improved student spaces (e.g., events and study space). The second observation is that students’ self-rating of the acquisition of key employment skills (specific knowledge and skills for employment) and life skills (interpersonal skills, self-confidence, and leadership) is below the national average. The University plans to conduct further research to improve its understanding of these issues. Both these observations inform proposed changes to University programs and services outlined in Part 3 of this document.

**Suggested Improvements**

A number of activities that maintain and improve performance of each theme were submitted as part of the 2014 Mid-Cycle Review. Briefly stated, the following key activities are underway and some actions were proposed to improve effectiveness.
Goal: Students gain the knowledge to complete the degree requirements.

Key activities to sustain and improve:
- Recruitment of students who best fit SFU’s academic profile and program choices.
- Support programs that encourage student retention, including those for specific populations (e.g., Indigenous, international, first-year, scholarship students, etc.).
- Policy/procedure/IT system features to promote/support academic success.
- Use of assessment data to track performance and make improvements.

New initiatives:
- Complete English as an Additional Language (EAL) project and implementation to support student success.
- Enhance programming to link academic choices (e.g., program and course selection) to chosen career.
- Increase the number and variety of activities recognized by SFU’s Co-curricular Record.
- Focus on developing targeted programs to address Truth and Reconciliation Commission recommendations to better support Aboriginal student success.
- Increase programs and services to meet the needs of commuter students.
- Enhance student residences and related residence life programming.
- Enhance policies and procedures that will improve course access for students (e.g., additional sections to meet demand, uniform use of waitlists in student information system, other system-based information to enhance planning, etc.).
- Implement Customer Relations Management system to coordinate student support.
- Examine recommendations from the Flexible Education Task Force (spring 2015).
- Review major scholarship programs.
- Revise evaluation of teaching (spring 2015).
- Educational goals and assessment will help inform external reviews.
- Establish a working group on student surveys.

Goal: Students acquire skills necessary in an ever-changing world.

Key activities to sustain and improve:
- Enhance experiential learning opportunities and develop staff and faculty community of practice.
- Professional development for graduate students (APEX program).
- Research-based opportunities (e.g., Tri-Council research assistantships, employment by faculty on research projects).

New initiatives:
- Complete implementation of Co-curricular Record.
- Increase support for participation in field schools and international co-operative education.
- Provide support for the development and diversification of field schools.

**Goal: Students apply knowledge in the workplace or further studies.**

Key activities to sustain and improve:
- Change undergraduate curriculum to emphasize writing, quantitative, and breadth requirements to better address employability skills.
- Improve career services (philosophy) to engage students earlier in making connection with academic choices.
- Add program offerings (co-operative education, certificates at the graduate and undergraduate level) to directly address employability.
- Implement bachelor’s-master’s concurrent programs.
- Enhance dual credit recognition bachelor’s/master’s courses.
- Incubation and innovation programs.
- Increase partnership programs with technical and applied schools.
- Draw on knowledge from business advisory boards to design and revise some programming.
- Continue to offer small grants for student-lead projects and initiatives.

New initiatives:
- Undertake a program proposal to enhance career planning for newly-admitted students to operate under a Faculty in conjunction with service units (e.g., Student Services and Learning Commons).

**Conclusion**

Overall, SFU is achieving satisfactory progress on its core theme of engaging students. In addition to the information collected related to SFU’s indicators, there is considerable evidence from institutional, provincial, and national surveys to substantiate the claim. SFU is committed to countless programs and services to maintain and improve its performance. The area of “student life” has been noted as an area for improvement and the institution is committed to undertaking the challenge in collaboration with students and the broader campus community.
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NWCCU mission fulfillment review of indicators: Research Theme Team

As per SFU’s Strategic Vision, the goal of SFU research is to be a world leader in knowledge mobilization building on a strong foundation of fundamental research. In the 2015 Research Theme Team Report, and subsequent documents, the theme team identified four outcomes and associated indicators to measure the performance of the Engaging Research Theme, with respect to the fulfillment of SFU’s Strategic Vision. The engaging research outcomes and indicators are provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGING RESEARCH</td>
<td>Research is at a high-quality level.</td>
<td>Total number of citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of publications in top journal percentiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge is mobilized through partnerships/collaborations with external partners.</td>
<td>Research income: Tri-Council funding ($) (SSHRC, NSERC, CIHR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of funded collaborative research projects with external partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of co-authored publications with external collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research is integrated into learning and teaching.</td>
<td>Number of graduate theses submitted to the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of undergraduate enrollments in one-on-one supervised research¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research investment is leveraged to drive innovation and transfer of technology for the benefit of society and the economy.</td>
<td>Number of new patents filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of industrial student internships through Mitacs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This year, the theme team has updated SFU’s research performance data, summarized below, and began the review of the indicators. Based on the team’s initial review and assessment, it believes that the indicators remains valid, and recommend one update. Considerations for further improvements to research data collection are currently under discussion, and a taskforce has begun work on identifying various options, including a new faculty CV system to streamline and improve collection of publication data to address the shortcoming of existing databases in their under-representation of the diversity of forms of scholarship, particularly in the arts, humanities, and social sciences.

¹ The methodology for this indicator has been updated this year to capture research training at the undergraduate level more comprehensively.
As suggested by the preliminary data above, SFU is on track with respect to most indicators, although some decreases in performance have been noted, such as a decline in Tri-Council funding (indicator 1.3.). Despite these fluctuations, the indicators remain valid as a measure of research performance. The theme team has noted that *Elsevier*, SFU’s data supplier for journal publications (indicator 1.2.), redefines top journals in each reporting year, which impacts the calculations for prior years, as recorded in previous report. Since the overall trend of the

---

2 All financial information is reported by fiscal year, whereas publication and enrollment data are reported by calendar year. For non-financial data, the corresponding calendar year refers to the year in which the FY year ends, e.g. 2015/16 refers to calendar year 2016.
University’s top publications remains comparable to previous years, the theme team believes this indicator remains valuable and valid.

Indicator 3.2 was revised to capture more broadly all undergraduate enrollments in courses involving research at the lower and upper division levels. Previously, this indicator was restricted to courses that required one-on-one supervision, including undergraduate research awards. Under the new methodology, the theme team proposes research training be considered more broadly to include all enrollments in courses involving research methods, field methods, directed reading, capstone project, or honours thesis/extended essay. The enrollment numbers are now reported by academic year. Under the new methodology, undergraduate research awards are not counted as part of this metric.

The indicators and their rationale are provided in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Definition and Source</th>
<th>Rationale for Indicator</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of citations</td>
<td>For each reporting year, the total number of citations for the preceding five years are counted. The citation counts are based on the number of times SFU articles, published within each five-year publication period, have been cited during the same period. <strong>Source: Previously InCites, now provided through Web of Science</strong></td>
<td>Citation analysis serves as an output and impact measure. The actual number of citations reflects research productivity, while the frequency of citations reflects the impact of the publications. As it takes several years for the research to be incorporated into work from other researchers, a five-year time window was chosen. The selected performance indicator incorporates both changes in output and impact.</td>
<td>Indicator remains valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of publications in top journal percentiles</td>
<td>Percentage of SFU articles published within the top 10% and top 5% of journals in fields where SFU research is active, using the Source-Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP) metric in SciVal. <strong>Source: SciVal</strong></td>
<td>While citation data is a widely-used indicator of research impact, publications in top journal percentiles provide a metric for benchmarking the quality of the University’s research relative to regional averages.</td>
<td>While numbers provided by data supplier vary slightly, the indicator remains valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Council research funding</td>
<td>Total dollars (in millions) of research funding per fiscal year. Research funding includes consolidated and non-consolidated entities. <strong>Source: CAUBO</strong></td>
<td>Total research funding is a generally accepted KPI for university research. It is collected annually by CAUBO and is commonly used in university rankings (Research Infosource, Times Higher Education Index, Maclean’s etc.). It is an input measure that serves as a good surrogate for research reputation and capacity.</td>
<td>Indicator remains valid in spite of fluctuations to funding scale, mainly due to faculty replacements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of funded collaborative research projects with external partners</td>
<td>Number of collaborative research projects: all grants and contracts excluding the Canada Foundation for Innovation, the British Columbia Knowledge Development Fund, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research, Genome BC, Genome Canada, SFU internal, and Canada Research Chairs. For the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, include only the Community-University Research Alliances, major collaborative research initiatives, partnership development grants, and partnership grants. For the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, include only collaborative and partnership programs, networks, and strategic and partnership projects. Source: Grant Track</td>
<td>Almost all research carried out in the University requires some funding. Collaborative research is funded by contracts or grants from partner organizations (business, foundations, government branches) or through special programs by the Tri-Council set up to support partnership grants. Indicator remains valid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of co-authored publications with external collaborators</td>
<td>Number of publications in which an SFU researcher has at least one co-author from an external organization outside of Canada (international), in Canada (national), or a corporate organization (academic-corporate). The total number of co-authored collaborations is equivalent to the total number of publications, minus all single-author publications. In each reporting year, the number of publications are reported for the prior calendar year to ensure all publications are counted. Source: SciVal</td>
<td>Number of co-authored publications with external collaborators provides a concrete measure of research productivity with partners, which showcases the degree of SFU engagement in research with collaborators across multiple levels: national, international, and corporate. Indicator remains valid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of graduate theses submitted to the library</td>
<td>Number of PhD and master’s theses submitted to the library within a calendar year, separated by degree type. In each reporting year, the number of theses for the prior calendar year are reported. Source: SFU Library</td>
<td>Writing a graduate thesis involves extensive research under the supervision of a senior supervisor and a thesis committee. The number of theses submitted to the library is indicative of the degree of graduate student engagement in research. Indicator remains valid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of undergraduate enrollments in research courses (revised)</td>
<td>Number of undergraduate enrollments in a research methods/field methods course, capstone project, directed reading, and honours thesis/extended essay within a calendar year. In each reporting year, the number of enrollments for the prior calendar year are reported. Source: Undergraduate Enrollment data (IRP)</td>
<td>SFU provides an immersive and supportive environment for undergraduate students to engage with faculty-directed research projects through various activities, including research-intensive courses and funding support for dedicated semesters in research. As such, active participation of undergraduate students indicates the University’s integration of research into learning and teaching. This indicator was revised to fully capture undergraduate enrollments in research more comprehensively. See discussion above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engaging Research Theme Team members and content contributors:

- Dr. Norbert Haunerland, Associate Vice-President, Research and Professor of Biological Sciences
- Dr. Gordon Myers, Associate Vice-President, Academic and Professor of Economics
- Dr. Wade Parkhouse, Dean and Associate Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
- Gwen Bird, Dean of Libraries and University Librarian
- Morgan Mameni, Coordinator, Institutional Research Support and Analysis
8.3 Engaging Communities

Review of Indicators for the NWCCU Year One Mission and Core Theme Self-Evaluation Report

December, 2016
A Review of the Engaging Communities Theme Team Indicators: Report Submitted to the University Planning Committee December 13, 2016

The three indicators listed below are currently used by the Community Engagement Theme Team to measure performance. The report that follows provides a review of each of these indicators and is presented to SFU’s University Planning Committee on behalf of Alumni Relations, SFU International, Continuing Studies, Public Square, SFU’s Vancity Office of Community Engagement, the SFU Surrey – TD Community Engagement Centre, Science Outreach Programs, SFU Summer Camps, and members of the Community Engagement Theme Team with support from SFU’s Office of Community Engagement.

- Alumni Engagement Score
- Number of Active International Partners
- Number of Participants in SFU Local Outreach
Alumni Engagement Score

Overview of SFU’s Alumni Engagement Score
SFU uses an engagement score that comprises the following categories and values:

- **Informed (1 point):**
  - Alumni are contactable: we have their phone number, address, and email.
- **Involved (2 points):**
  - Alumni are active or involved with the Blackbaud Internet Solutions online directory.
  - Alumni have attended an event in the last fiscal year.
  - Alumni are a member of the SFU Board of Governors, SFU Senate, and/or Alumni Association current board members, or were Alumni Association past board members.
- **Invested (3 points):**
  - Alumni are donating or plan to make a gift in the past fiscal year.

All points are tallied and averaged over the total number of alumni to obtain the engagement score.

The data are pulled from the Advancement and Alumni Engagement database, Blackbaud, and is provided to Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) to calculate on an annual basis.

### Annual SFU Alumni Engagement Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Engagement Score</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Validity of Existing Alumni Engagement Score**

The decision to adopt the categories *informed, involved, invested* as an indication of alumni engagement was based largely on prevailing industry standards and current literature.

The theme team recognizes that these categories are broad, that they include limited components, and that the system of weighting different categories may be somewhat simplistic. Now, in the fifth year of having data to compare, this indicator will undergo review and assessment to ensure the components are being accurately captured within each category, and that the respective weighting and tabulation correctly reflect alumni engagement.

Appendix 8.3
The current model, while practical to execute, was designed to serve as a breadth (binary) model to measure alumni engagement across the institution. The model was also developed prior to the introduction of the central alumni engagement database, Blackbaud’s eCRM, which now captures additional engagement metrics. Consequently, there may be additional factors that could contribute to a more sophisticated weighting model for this indicator.

For example, the present model does not account for alumni who participate in surveys or focus groups, or who meet with alumni or advancement staff—both of which could be considered high indicators of engagement. Data that could be informed by academic areas (e.g., alumni volunteers) are also not being included in the present indicator—largely due to lack of practical ability to regularly input and maintain consistent data from all academic areas.

Additionally, the present indicator provides fairly minimal insight into meaningful differences of alumni engagement. For example, if the aggregate alumni engagement score changes by a factor of 0.01 from one year to another (as it did from 2014/15 to 2015/16), what can we interpret from that change and is it a factor of significance?

**Potential Enhancement to Alumni Engagement Score**

Two key initiatives are currently being stewarded by SFU’s Office of Advancement and Alumni Engagement.

First, the University Advancement and Alumni Engagement portfolio is undergoing a strategic review, which is expected to inform necessary changes that should be made to the University’s alumni engagement efforts and initiatives, as well as yield additional recommendations on how to better assess and measure alumni engagement.

Second, while the current alumni engagement measure is designed as a breadth model, SFU is exploring a segmented model that may allow constituents to be classified into distinct sub-populations to potentially better gauge success in relation to strategic goals. This segmented model could generate a meaningful points score per individual graduate, which, in turn, may enable the University to more accurately identify which alumni are the most engaged.

The adoption of a more meaningful scale is expected to assist in the following potential goals:

- To assess both individual and overall engagement levels over a period of time.
- To identify which activities and initiatives yield the highest levels of participation and engagement.
- To better identify and articulate the various ways in which alumni can engage with the institution.
• To discover alumni who are champions and ambassadors that can be cultivated for numerous purposes to contribute towards the University’s broader goals and objectives.

A Future Model for Consideration
A future model is being explored that may capture a wider assortment of engagement variables and classify alumni in more specific terms.

The goal of the model (below) is to track impact and outcomes versus output. Those with the highest number of points (total of 6) can be considered to be among the most engaged and may constitute a pool of alumni who could be cultivated for additional engagement and involvement opportunities. Scores can be generated for total population, for each alumni demographic segment, and for individuals.

The points in this model are not designed to be assigned to each sub-item as this would make it challenging to add/remove items in future and could skew future and retrospective reporting results. Flexibility to add/remove items without altering the score substantially is an important requirement.

Prior to finalizing the model, the top 100 donors will be tested using the model that is selected to ensure validity and that intended outcomes result from the application of the model.

1-2 pts: Peeking over the Fence  I  3 pts: Connected  I  4-5 pts: Champion  I  6 pts: Ambassador
(items in red are currently not collected in the Blackbaud database)

INFORMED: 1 point
• Answered the phone and spoke with a student caller.
• Updated a piece of contact and/or employment information.
• Email address on record.
• Registered for alumni email forwarding.
• Connected LinkedIn account.
• Provided Canada Anti-Spam Law consent.
• Alumni portal login.
• Member of the SFU Alumni LinkedIn Group.

INVOLVED: 2 points
• Submitted a nomination for an Outstanding Alumni Award.
• Represented SFU at an installation ceremony.
• Submitted a nomination for a Simon Fraser Alumni Association (SFUAA) Board position.
• Was nominated for an SFUAA Board position.
• Participated in a survey/focus group (that was tracked).
• Registered for an event (but did not attend).
• Is a co-op employer.
• Posted a job.
• Booked the Diamond Alumni Centre for a wedding.
• SFU award recipient (e.g., Outstanding Alumni Award) this year.
• Member of the Alumni Association.
• Participant in a Continuing Studies offering.
• Was re-admitted for an additional SFU credential/program.
• Opened at least 9 e-newsletters and clicked on at least one link in each.
• Child attended SFU Summer Camp.

INVESTED: 3 points
• Volunteered (e.g., Alumni Board, speaker in a classroom, regional ambassador, event host).
• Attended an SFU event.
• Athletics season ticket holder.
• Alumni who met with a VPAAE staff person (Alumni and Advancement) – e.g., managed prospects.
• Made a financial gift and/or pledge (and which of those increased an annual gift).
• Confirmed a planned gift.

SAMPLE chart to illustrate how points will be displayed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Level</th>
<th>Non-Existent (0 points)</th>
<th>Low (1-2 points)</th>
<th>Medium (3 points)</th>
<th>High (4-5 points)</th>
<th>Ideal (6 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptor</td>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>Peeking over the fence</td>
<td>Connected</td>
<td>Champion</td>
<td>Ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Population</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>2,175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Active International Partners

Overview of the Active International Partners Indicator
SFU International tracks current agreements with partner institutions, including student exchange, field schools, teacher education modules, international co-op placements, short-term research mobility, memorandums of understanding (MOU), letters of intent (LOI), dual degrees and certificates, and field schools. For each partner institution, SFU International tallies the number of agreements with one point for a MOU, one for a mobility agreement, one for an agreement for a dual degree, and so on.

Annual Active International Partners Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of active international partners</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individual participants in locally-held international community engagement events</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the number of active international partnerships from 2010/11 to 2015/16 as recorded by SFU International depicting, on average, positive growth across the period measured. New this year is an indication of the level of global engagement locally as reflected by the number of individual participants attending international community engagement events hosted by SFU International. Appendix 1 on page 11/12 illustrates the global reach of SFU’s international partnerships by country and by type of agreement.

The data reveal an increase in international collaborations as reflected by the number of new agreements signed and those renewed over 2015/16. Student mobility agreements include a range of agreements that support the movement of students to and from partner institutions and organizations. These activities include student exchange, field schools, teacher education modules, international co-op placements, and short-term research mobility. Program agreements reflect the formalization of collaborations for the joint delivery of programming whether curricular, research, international development, and/or community engagement collaborations.
Indicator Principles: Relevance, Practicality, Intuitive

The current active international partnerships indicator is practical and intuitive; however, it is likely not the most effective, nor the most relevant measure of international engagement. The weakness of the current indicator is clearly evidenced as SFU International strives for deeper and more multifaceted engagement as opposed to a greater quantity of agreements. Under the current system, a reduced number of agreements that are more multifaceted and potentially supportive of deeper engagement would result in a lower indicator and may suggest lower engagement when the opposite may be true.

With this in mind, SFU International is investigating a shift from the current indicator to a multi-variable assessment of global engagement that reflects not only the number of international agreements, but also considers the various types of international activities as indicators of engagement. These indicators would be derived from a range of data, including international student mobility numbers, numbers of international degree-seeking students, global donor profile, engaged international alumni, international development projects, number of joint research publications with international collaborators, etc.

This multivariable analysis would provide a weighted measure of engagement per country with a particular focus on measuring progress in countries/regions of strategic priority. Additionally, global engagement would also be measured by capturing internationalization at home efforts, which includes internationalization of the curriculum, engagement with local diaspora communities, participation in locally-held international community engagement events, university efforts with respect to refugee and immigrant settlement, and others. In both categories, indicators would be represented through quantitative measures and weighted against a scale of engagement in order to benchmark year over year.
Number of Participants in Local Outreach Programs

Overview of the Number of Participants in Local Outreach Programs Indicator

In 2014, the Community Engagement Theme Team decided that it would be useful to implement a small number of meaningful quantitative indicators that would track a cross-section of SFU programs, knowing that adopting this process would mean that “the number of participants in local outreach programs” indicator would not be indicative of the full range of community participants in public lectures and other outreach programs at SFU. In 2008/09 and 2009/10 this indicator included summer camp participants, Philosophers’ Café participants, and Friends of Simon participation. In 2010/11 and 2011/12 Continuing Studies lectures and events were added to the indicator, in 2012/13 Public Square participation was added to the indicator, and in 2013/14 Science Outreach Program participation was added to the indicator. In 2015/16 it is expected that outreach related to the programs of the Vancity Office of Community Engagement, the SFU Surrey – TD Community Engagement Centre and several additional Continuing Studies programs (Liberal Arts, 55+ Program, Public Relations, Digital Communications, Community Capacity Building and Code Camp) will be added to the indicator.

Number of Participants in Local Outreach Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at summer camps (Source: Athletics)</td>
<td>5,243</td>
<td>5,423</td>
<td>5,432</td>
<td>4,953</td>
<td>5,799</td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td>6,189</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophers Café Participation (Source: Continuing Studies)</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>3,793</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>3,549</td>
<td>3,158</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Studies Lectures and Events (Source: Continuing Studies)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4,777</td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td>7,966</td>
<td>6,583</td>
<td>5,727</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Simon Participation (Source: Friends of Simon)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Outreach Programs (Source: Faculty of Science)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>23,444</td>
<td>26,536</td>
<td>36,386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Square Outreach Programs (Source: Public Square)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6,176</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>9,056</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancity Office of Community Engagement Events (Source: Vancity Office of Community Engagement)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU Surrey – TD Community Engagement Centre Participation (Source: SFU Surrey – TD Community Engagement Centre)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,780</td>
<td>9,426</td>
<td>13,905</td>
<td>13,879</td>
<td>23,953</td>
<td>47,407</td>
<td>50,734</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With participation in additional outreach programs being added to the indicator over time, the total number of participants in local outreach programs has trended upwards. In most instances, participation in individual programs has also shown an upward trend.

**Indicator Principles: Relevance, Practicality, Intuitive**

The SFU departments noted in the table above routinely count and keep records of the number of participants attending their outreach and engagement sessions. This makes the “number of participants in local outreach programs” indicator very practical as it is simple for each department to measure attendance.

The “number of participants in local outreach programs” indicator is also easy to understand. It provides a measure of participation in community-focused activities, and one can quickly see whether there has been an increase or decrease in attendance from year to year. As a broad indicator of activity, it holds value.

With respect to relevance of the indicator as a stand-alone measure of community engagement, the Community Engagement Theme Team reiterated its interest in evolving to a greater understanding of the impact of community engagement by further investigating and implementing qualitative research and assessment. The current “number of participants in local outreach programs” indicator provides a quantitative dimension to attendance but the theme team observed that it doesn’t provide a useful indicator of participant satisfaction or impact. In addition, the Community Engagement Theme Team observed that it didn’t offer the depth of information needed to make decisions that would lead to improvements in programming, events, or engagement and suggested that it would be useful to employ qualitative assessments to obtain an indication of how a particular program or activity has made a difference in the lives of those involved (participants, volunteers, teachers/staff/admin, and the partnership between the community and SFU). In instances where a SFU-community partnership was involved, the Community Engagement Theme Team suggested that the development and implementation of a partner rating index might offer a way of assigning a quantitative value to depict partner experience and satisfaction.

The Community Engagement Theme Team also offered some cautions:

1. With many community engagement initiatives funded by non-recurring funds or through one-time investments provided by external funders, it was recommended that aspirational targets not be set for future years due to the programming risk that results from an instable funding structure. It was observed that this funding structure also runs counter to SFU’s ability to forge strong relationships with community because initiative funding is often incompatible
with the length of time needed to build trusting, deep relationships that are likely to have real, mutual positive impact.

2. The committee reinforced their belief that impact was more important than measuring the quantity of participants in attendance. With this in mind, they iterated their concern associated with setting quantitative targets related to numbers of participants as doing so would provide an incentive to increase participation and may be a deterrent to the creation of programs with lower enrollment that may result in the deep impact desired for positive results.

3. SFU’s university-wide IT systems are not particularly well developed for the purpose of university-community interaction and engagement. A university-wide CRM hasn’t yet been adopted, nor has a university-wide event management system. In the absence of these systems, SFU’s efforts at collecting data that would offer additional quantitative measurements and assist with relationship management are hampered.
### Appendix 1: Number of Active International Partners per Country and per Type for 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Type of Agreement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOU/LOI[^1]</td>
<td>Student Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1]: MOU – Memorandum of Understanding
LOI – Letter of Intent

Appendix 8.3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom/England</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom/Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average Fundraising Activity

A new indicator to track the success of the Engaging Communities or Leveraging Institutional Strength theme is “average fundraising activity” across a range of constituent types and designation categories. Charitable giving to University priorities is an indicator of alumni engagement (and is included in that indicator as one of several weighting factors), community engagement, alignment with external interests and trends. Charitable gifts support the University’s mission and strategic planning across all Faculties.

University Advancement’s robust database software (Blackbaud’s eCRM) enables reporting on fundraising activity by donor type, faculty, fund type, gift type, and a range of other criteria.

Year-over-year fundraising activity – defined as outright gifts and pledges to give – is reported monthly by the Vice-President, Advancement and Alumni Engagement to SFU’s Board of Governors. However, as an indicator of community engagement or leveraging institutional strength, a three-year moving average of fundraising activity will give a better indicator of long-term trends without the distraction of extraordinary gifts in a particular year.

A demonstration of a three-year average of fundraising activity by donor type is an indicator of both increasing alumni support and increasing community support.
A three-year average of fundraising activity by fund type is an indicator of how charitable giving contributes to University priorities.

Engaging Community Theme Team members and content contributors:

- Joanne Curry, Vice-President, External Relations (Chair)
- Sean Markey, Associate Dean, Faculty of Environment
- Stephen Smith, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education
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8.4 Leveraging Institutional Strength

Review of Indicators for the NWCCU Year One Mission and Core Theme Self-Evaluation Report

January, 2017
INTRODUCTION

The following report is in response to the NWCCU’s 2016 Initial Accreditation Peer-Evaluation Report, and specifically, to the report’s recommendation that SFU develop indicators and metrics across all levels of the University to more fully assess accomplishment of core theme goals. The NWCCU report went on to note that some of the indicators were found to be “somewhat superficial reflections of institutional accomplishments” and that, “the selection of more meaningful indicators could yield more valuable data and insights to inform the university’s efforts at continuous improvement.”

The fundamental theme of “Leveraging Institutional Strength” is the fourth pillar of SFU’s University Planning Framework. The theme’s purpose is to acknowledge and assess the University’s performance with respect to financial sustainability, reliability of IT services, attracting and retaining the best people, and providing a physical infrastructure that is fit for purpose. A “theme team” was created to undertake a review of the Leveraging Institutional Strength theme and revisit the appropriateness and robustness of the key indicators included within.

In addition to the indicator comments, the NWCCU asked the University to revisit its emergency and disaster planning protocols, such as annual drills and assessments, “to ensure the preparedness of all community members” in case of a significant emergency event. The formal response to this request is included in Part II of the report.

THEME DESCRIPTION

FUNDAMENTAL THEME: LEVERAGING INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTH

GOAL – TO BECOME FINANCIALLY FLEXIBLE THROUGH CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS, STRENGTHENING OF INFRASTRUCTURE, AND RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF THE BEST PEOPLE.

The supporting activities that underpin this goal focus on:
- Improving administrative systems;
- Recruiting and retaining the best people; and
- Strengthening infrastructure.

Successfully executing these activities are expected to produce the following outcomes:
- The University is financially sound.
- The University has IT services that support its priorities.
- The University attracts and retains the best people.
The University has facilities that meets its needs.

The following assessment will test the veracity and completeness of the indicators related to these outcomes.

PART I - ASSESSMENT OF THEME INDICATORS

OUTCOME 1: SFU IS FINANCIALLY SOUND

INDICATOR 1.1: Net operating assets as a percentage of consolidated revenues

Net operating assets reflect the cumulative surpluses (losses) generated from the operating fund and are one indicator of the overall financial health of the University. A healthy balance sheet position provides the University with the ability to handle future unplanned liabilities and funding requirements. Operating assets include various components such as departmental carry forwards, investment surplus (loss) carryovers, and unfunded future costs (liabilities).

SFU’s carry forward guidelines limit the level of cumulative carry forward in units to 9% of the total operating budget. Consistent with this guideline, and based on comparatives with other Canadian universities, a positive net operating asset balance of up to 10% of consolidated revenues represents a reasonable and appropriate balance of net operating assets.

As can be seen above, this indicator has remained at an appropriate level over the previous six years. The introduction of new public sector accounting standards has led to a reduction in the indicator, as has the prudent and measured release of reserves. For the fiscal year ended 2015/16, net operating assets were $18.4 million, or 2.8% of consolidated revenue. The University uses the range of 2% to 9% to represent a reasonable level of operational reserves, given that other factors, such as the
University’s operating contingency, also contribute to the overall financial health of the University.

The NWCCU Report indicated that the low end of the 2%-9% range might not provide a significant enough buffer to protect against a surprise drop in revenue due to issues such as declining enrollment or a drop in the provincial operating grant. However, the report goes on to acknowledge that the University has access to additional reserves, such as a 3% contingency fund and other designated internally restricted operating assets that do provide further comprehensive support in maintaining core programs and services in a financially challenging environment.

**Update to the Current Indicator(s)**

With both the University and the NWCCU agreeing that the above indicator is an important measure for assessing performance, there is no plan to change it. However, the University is introducing an additional metric related to the growth and investment return on the endowment portfolio. This is particularly important in the current provincial post-secondary funding environment of domestic tuition increase caps and limited changes in the operating grant, since the strength of endowment portfolio has a direct impact on the University’s present and future financial position.

The Ellement Consulting Group provides the University’s risk and investment analytics. Ellement has composed a composite five-year rolling benchmark comprised of a weighted basket of Canadian, US, and International equity and bond issues, as well as Canadian 91 day treasury bills. The University uses this benchmark to assess the performance of its endowment portfolio and considers any returns in excess of the benchmark an indication of positive investment performance.

![Bar chart showing actual vs benchmark endowment return](chart.png)

As can be seen above, over the previous three years (as measured at June 30), the University has consistently outperformed the benchmark return. This has led to strong...
growth in the endowment portfolio, which, at mid-year 2016, was valued at $416 million.

OUTCOME 2: SFU HAS IT SERVICES THAT SUPPORT ITS PRIORITIES

INDICATOR 2.1: Joint availability of core services

For the purposes of this indicator, SFU defined its core IT services to include four representative but critical systems:

- SFU Connect (enterprise collaboration based on Zimbra Collaboration Suite).
- Canvas (locally hosted learning and management system).
- SIMS (Student Information Management System).
- Off-Campus Internet Connectivity (ability for users to access the internet through and from the SFU campus network).

Below are the most recent indicator results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2.1: Joint availability of core services</th>
<th>Service/System</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Availability of Core Services: SFU Connect, Canvas, SIMS &amp; Off-Campus Internet Connectivity</td>
<td>Connect</td>
<td>99.88</td>
<td>99.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canvas</td>
<td>99.72</td>
<td>99.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIMS</td>
<td>99.88</td>
<td>99.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off-Campus Internet</td>
<td>99.88</td>
<td>99.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metric (Product of 4)</td>
<td>99.36</td>
<td>99.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average of 4</td>
<td>99.84</td>
<td>99.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicator was updated from the previous metric of “ratio of operating and project resources to total operating resources.” During the period of transition that SFU’s IT group has experienced over the past 12 months (including hiring a new Chief Information Officer), focusing on core services was considered an important “back to basics” step during this interim phase. However, it was acknowledged that this tactical metric is broad based, unweighted, and susceptible to diminishing returns.
Update to the Current Indicator(s)

IT Services has been undertaking a significant revisioning through its “One I.S.” focused strategic planning and consultation process. This process began in the fall of 2016 and is expected to continue into the fall of 2017. All aspects of the organizational structure, resources, relationships, and processes are under review. Comprehensive customer feedback surveys have been deployed, one-on-one stakeholder discussions are underway, and focus groups comprised of key users and related IT personnel are being organized for early in the new year. This is being supplemented by an external review of major administrative functions within the department, scheduled for January 2017.

Through its One I.S. strategy, IT Services has identified over thirty qualitative and quantitative metrics to assess performance in its nine key organizational dimensions (the left panel in the graphic above). During the strategic planning process, these will be refined, benchmarked, and tracked to ensure IT is meeting the service needs of the University and its customers and employees. Select performance indicators in the plan include:

1. Improve service desk responsiveness to faculty, staff, students, researchers, community members, and all stakeholders and measure the results through customer satisfaction surveys.
2. Increase the number of managed desktops.
3. Reduce login time to access infrastructure.
4. Reduce delivery time for procurement of standard hardware.
5. Improve performance across network services.
6. Implement innovative applications systems that meet immediate customer needs.
7. Increase standardization of information systems services via enterprise approaches.

IT Services continues to make significant progress in assessing its accomplishments and ensuring it is well aligned with the institutional goals focused on students, the community, and the research enterprise. Upon completion of the IT strategic consultation, the existing core services indicator will be replaced by a more meaningful set of IT indicators to enhance assessment in this critical function.

Additional information pertaining to the One I.S. vision can be found at the following link:

http://www.sfu.ca/itservices/strategy-and-policy/vision-for-sfu-information-systems.html

OUTCOME 3: SFU ATTRACTS AND RETAINS THE BEST PEOPLE

INDICATOR 3.1: Canada’s Top 100 Employers

SFU is one of the largest employers within the City of Burnaby and has a substantial employment presence in downtown Vancouver and the City of Surrey. The University is consistently recognized as one of the best employers, both in the province and in the country.

The Leveraging Institutional Strength theme team previously determined that having SFU included in a prominent list of Canada’s Top 100 Employers is an effective measure of the University’s ability to attract and retain quality staff and faculty. The measurement is taken from the country’s leading employment periodicals publisher, Mediacorp Canada, which assesses employers using eight criteria:

- Physical workspace.
- Work atmosphere and social atmosphere.
- Health, financial, and family benefits.
- Vacation and time off.
- Employee communications.
- Performance management.
- Training and skills development.
- Community involvement.

Employers are compared to other organizations in their field to determine which offers the most progressive and forward-thinking programs. SFU has been included in Mediacorp’s list of Canada’s Top 100 Employers every year since 2008, which reflects...
the University’s ongoing commitment to its employees and its ability to provide them with a positive work environment and culture.

SFU was also named by Mediacorp as one of Canada’s Top Family-Friendly Employers and British Columbia’s Top Employers for 2016.

*Update to the Current Indicator(s)*

Mediacorp’s Canada’s Top 100 Employers list is a nationally recognized source for those desiring to work within the country’s best organizations. Its evaluation criteria are multidimensional and its analytical techniques are comprehensive and systematic. At this time, there is no requirement to change this indicator.

The University has recently hired a new head of Human Resources and elevated the role from Executive Director to Associate Vice-President (AVP). The new AVP has a 2017 plan to complete a dashboard of “people” metrics. There have been significant efforts to date, but there is much work to be done. However, once the dashboard is complete, the comprehensive data set will be used internally to drive detailed HR strategies and plans, as well as provide an ongoing monitor of departmental performance.

Through an environmental scan, it generally appears that other institutions, if publishing broad foundational measures (e.g., beyond student and research strategies), are using an employee engagement survey measure. For the University to move in this direction (something it strongly supports), there needs to be significant thought and research put into it prior to launch. These efforts are also part of the new AVP’s plan for 2017. Activity-based assessment indicators are also under review, e.g., the percentage of staff with performance development plans in place, or the percentage of budget devoted to staff development. It is expected that such measures will be an important component of the new HR dashboard.

It should also be noted that, although not embedded directly within the Human Resources assessment portfolio, individual departments are including people-centric measures within their performance reporting. For example, both Financial Services and
IT Services have specific departmental metrics focused on the completion rate of employee personal development plans.

OUTCOME 4: SFU HAS FACILITIES THAT MEET ITS NEEDS

INDICATOR 4.1: Facilities Condition Index (FCI)

The SFU Burnaby campus is now 50 years old and suffers from ongoing deferred maintenance issues. The rehabilitation and renewal of aging facilities and infrastructure at the Burnaby campus are required to extend the useful life of facilities and to improve the sustainability and functionality of these facilities.

Using the Facilities Condition Index (FCI), an accepted industry metric (and utilized by most BC post-secondary institutions) for determining the relative condition of a group of facilities at a specific point in time, SFU is able to assess the condition of its buildings and facilities. The theme team confirmed that FCI is an effective indicator in determining the functionality and safety of SFU’s physical infrastructure. The measure is available for specific buildings or can be grouped by use or location, which has been done in the illustration below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building/Asset Portfolio</th>
<th># Buildings</th>
<th>Area (GASM)</th>
<th>Current Replacement Value (CRV)</th>
<th>Facility Condition Index (FCI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Academic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>261,922</td>
<td>$1,298,572,733</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Non-Academic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29,002</td>
<td>$131,051,349</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Residences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61,277</td>
<td>$296,673,275</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31,503</td>
<td>$190,476,991</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21,370</td>
<td>$131,902,124</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>404,074</td>
<td>$2,048,676,472</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A new building has an FCI of zero and a building with an FCI of 1.00 has no useful life left. SFU’s FCI of 0.46 for 2015/16 falls just short of the range of “poor” condition (FCI > 0.50). However, as seen above, this is a measure of the University’s entire building portfolio, with many buildings having an FCI far in excess of 0.46 and some buildings being in better condition. Complicating the issue is that, from a statistical standpoint, the standard deviation of the FCI for the building population is quite large, meaning that, although the average is a 0.46, there remains a significant number of buildings with a very high FCI and are reaching (or have reached) the end of their useful life.
The graph above measures the building portfolio over the previous four years (the dotted line indicates that there was no review undertaken in 2014/15). The last comprehensive FCI assessment was completed in early 2016 and showed a decrease from 0.47 to 0.46 from the review in 2013/14. With buildings having a total current replacement value of over $2 billion, it is extremely difficult to make major shifts in the index. However, a lowering of the indicator of the magnitude above still represents a positive performance in the University’s efforts at addressing its deferred maintenance needs.

Update to the Current Indicator(s)

Addressing issues of deferred maintenance and building renewal at the Burnaby campus continues to be a key priority. Projects are being undertaken to improve student study spaces, classrooms, building envelopes, and building systems infrastructure. Major new capital projects are also underway, including the construction of a new 100,000 square foot, $55 million student union building scheduled for completion in late 2018, and a new, $126 million high-tech engineering building under development at the Surrey campus, slated for mid-2018 completion.

While the FCI remains the best singular measure for the assessment of the University’s physical infrastructure, additional indicators are under development to further assess the degree to which the facilities meet the needs of the University. These include:

1. Percentage of classrooms meeting benchmark quality standards

   Indicator: \[ \frac{\text{total } \# \text{ classrooms/theatres with upgrades } \leq 20/25 \text{ years}}{\text{total } \# \text{ classrooms/theatres on campus}} \]

   The target has been set at upgrading all classrooms every 20 years and all theatres every 25 years. An increase in the percentage of rooms within this targeted cycle is a robust indication of the University’s ability to uphold livability standards while
ensuring that the technological and space requirements of an evolving pedagogical landscape continue to be satisfied.

2. **Total estimate of Priority 1 deferred maintenance**

   **Indicator:** total value of Priority 1 deferred maintenance outstanding

   Priority 1 items are those that should be done in the current year. This is the best measure of deferred maintenance. A significant year-over-year increase in this metric indicates that the University is further falling behind in its maintenance and renewal schedule. A stable or declining metric is an indication that annual renewal funding is having a positive impact on the state of campus infrastructure that is in most urgent need of repair.

3. **Preventive maintenance completion rates**

   **Indicator:** total preventative maintenance orders completed annually
   
   \[
   \text{total preventative maintenance orders completed annually} \bigg/ \text{total preventative maintenance orders scheduled}
   \]

   An increase in this indicator demonstrates that proactive work is being done to ensure facilities and systems operate as intended and has a medium- to long-term effect of positively impacting future deferred maintenance commitments.

4. **Service request turn-around time**

   **Indicator:** average time between the open and closing of service requests

   This measures the average time for a service request to be completed. A reduction in this metric is an indication of the improved responsiveness of Facilities Services personnel to address maintenance issues and is a good indicator of departmental performance when measured on an annual basis. Service requests can vary widely in severity and time to complete. However, over a twelve-month time horizon, the volume of service orders received, when stratified by severity and expected completion time, is generally stable year over year, thereby validating the metric.

**CONCLUSION**

The fundamental theme of “Leveraging Institutional Strength” underpins the success of the University’s three core themes related to students, research and communities. The results of the indicators show that the University is undertaking many initiatives to advance this theme. However, the results of the theme team review were consistent with the views of the NWCCU report in that additional indicators were an important step forward in assessing the accomplishments of the University and better understanding how well the University is fulfilling its mission of engagement.
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